

The Review of English Studies

VOL. IV.—No. 16.

OCTOBER 1928.

HAZLITT'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEW

BY P. L. CARVER

IN identifying the articles contributed by Hazlitt to the *Edinburgh Review*, Messrs. Waller and Glover followed very closely the list given by Mr. Ireland in his work of 1868. Both lists are drawn up with extreme caution, and that of Hazlitt's editors may be taken as the irreducible minimum. Of four of the articles discussed in the following notes Hazlitt's authorship has not, so far as I know, been suspected. The reviews of "Sardanapalus," "The Story of Rimini" and "The History of Painting in Italy" are mentioned by Messrs. Waller and Glover, but their claims are not allowed.

Spence's Anecdotes (E.R. vol. 33).

The strongest evidence for Hazlitt's authorship of this article is shown by the parallel passages set out below :

The anonymous reviewer (1820)

A minute, but voluminous critic of our time, has laboured hard to show, that to this list should be added the name of Massinger. But the proofs adduced in support of this conjecture are extremely inconclusive. Among others, the writer insists on the profusion of crucifixes, glories, angelic visions, garlands of roses, and clouds of incense scattered through the "Virgin-Marytr" as evidence of the

*Hazlitt on "Mr. Gifford" in the
"Spirit of the Age" (1825)*

Thus, for instance, in attempting to add the name of Massinger to the list of Catholic poets, our minute critic insists on the profusion of crucifixes, glories, angelic visions, garlands of roses and clouds of incense scattered through the *Virgin-Martyr*, as evidence of the theological sentiments meant to be inculcated by the play, when the least reflection might have taught him that they proved nothing but the

theological sentiments meant to be inculcated by this play; when the least reflection might have taught him that they proved nothing but his author's poetical conception of the character and costume of his subject: A writer might, with the same sinister shrewdness, be suspected of Heathenism for talking of Flora and Ceres, in a poem on the Seasons; and what are produced as the exclusive badges of Catholic bigotry, are nothing but the adventitious ornaments and external emblems—in a word, the *poetry* of Christianity in general. What indeed shows the frivolousness of the whole inference, is, that Decker, who is asserted by our critic to have contributed some of the most passionate and fantastic of these devotional scenes, is not even accused of a leaning to Popery.

author's poetical conception of the character and *costume* of his subject. A writer might, with the same sinister, short-sighted shrewdness, be accused of Heathenism for talking of Flora and Ceres in a poem on the Seasons! What are produced as the exclusive badges and occult proofs of Catholic bigotry, are nothing but the adventitious ornaments and external symbols, the gross and sensible language—in a word, the *poetry* of Christianity in general. What indeed shows the frivolousness of the whole inference is that Decker, who is asserted by our critic to have contributed some of the most passionate and fantastic of these devotional scenes, is not even suspected of a leaning to Popery.

Hazlitt has never been suspected of plagiarism; but in view of the remote possibility that an extract from the article might have found its way into his notes by an unaccountable error, the following additional points may be added:

1. The reviewer remarks that "Pope used to express his distaste for Spenser by making it a rule to ask people whether they had ever read the *Faery Queen* through." In his lecture on "Chaucer and Spenser" Hazlitt refers to Pope's habit of asking this question.

2. The reviewer relates that "the heroes of the Dunciad discovered that the initials and final letter of his [Pope's] name composed the syllable A.P.E." Hazlitt mentions the same fact in his essay *On the Qualifications Necessary to Success in Life*.

3. In his article on Sir Joshua Reynolds, Hazlitt derides the belief formerly entertained that Sir Joshua was not the real author of the Discourses which went by his name. The reviewer of Spence remarks, by way of illustration, "It was a long time before people would believe that Sir Joshua Reynolds wrote his own discourses."

The article is particularly valuable for a critical study of Bolingbroke: a character of whom Hazlitt has not given his opinion at any length in his acknowledged writings.

The History of Painting in Italy (E.R. vol. 32)

If the case for "Spence's Anecdotes" is established we are provided with a small piece of additional evidence in favour of this article, which was accepted by Mr. Ireland and rejected by Messrs.

Waller and Glover. In the review of "Spence's Anecdotes" we read: "Burke long since asked, 'Who reads Bolingbroke now?'" The reviewer of the "History of Painting in Italy" quotes thus from his author: "'Aujourd'hui' (he petulantly asks, as Mr. Burke, though with better reason, did of Bolingbroke), 'qui est-ce qui lit la Bible?'"

Moore and Byron (E.R. vol. 38)

This article is included in Lord Cockburn's list of Jeffrey's contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*, but that list is known to be untrustworthy. The style is Hazlitt's in its concentrated essence. The principle by which Moore's poetry is judged, together with much of the phraseology, reappears in the *Spirit of the Age* and in the *Lectures on the English Poets*. The essay does not easily lend itself to verbal comparison, the material being rearranged in the two works which I have mentioned, but as literary style is a matter for individual judgement I offer such fragments of internal evidence as are separable from the whole.

The anonymous reviewer (1823)

Poetry, in his hands, becomes a kind of *cosmetic art*—it is the poetry of the toilette.

It is not a picture that he gives us, but an inventory of beauty.

We are cloyed with sweetness and dazzled with splendour. Every image must "blush celestial rosy red, love's proper hue," every syllable must breathe a sigh. A sentiment is lost in a simile—the simile is overloaded with an epithet. It is like "morn risen on mid-noon."

Hazlitt on Moore in the "Spirit of the Age" (1825)

Mr. Moore has a little mistaken the art of poetry for the *cosmetic art*.

His is the poetry of the bath, of the toilette, of the saloon.

He makes out an inventory of beauty.

He indeed cloyes with sweetness; he obscures with splendour. . . . His gorgeous style is like another "morn risen on mid-noon." There is no passage that is not made up of blushing lines, no line that is not enriched with a sparkling metaphor, no image that is left unadorned with a double epithet.

Byron's "Sardanapalus" (E.R. vol. 36)

Mr. P. P. Howe, in his biography of Hazlitt, refers to this article as "one of the minor mysteries attaching to the editorship" of the *Edinburgh Review*. Mr. Ireland did not admit it, and Messrs. Waller and Glover rejected it decisively. The external evidence is to be found in a letter written by Hazlitt to P. G. Patmore, in which he says, in the course of his account of a talk with Jeffrey, "My Sardanapalus is to be in." As there is nothing in Hazlitt's later correspondence to indicate that his expectation had been dis-

appointed, it is very difficult to believe that Jeffrey changed his mind after the interview and substituted another article on the same subject for the one which he had accepted from Hazlitt.

Messrs. Waller and Glover state the whole of the opposing case and deliver judgement in one sentence. Commenting on the letter to Patmore, they say : " Whatever the explanation may be, the review of Sardanapalus which *did* appear in the *Edinburgh* was written by Jeffrey himself, and is included in his *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review*."

The fact mentioned in the last words of this pronouncement is not conclusive. There is no reason to suspect Jeffrey's good faith, but it is evident from the account given by his biographer that when he compiled the authorised list of his articles, in December 1840, his memory was failing. We are told that in cases of doubt he recalled " some fact, or phrase, or metaphor, or striking sentence," saying to Lord Cockburn, " If that be there it is mine." This disclosure must be considered in relation to the fact that Jeffrey frequently subjected the work of contributors to the process which he himself described as " vamping and patching." After making his selection, we are told, " he said that there might possibly be one or two mistakes, but that he did not think that there were any." From the list so compiled he selected, three years later, the articles comprising his *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review*. It is reasonable to suppose that he exercised more care on the second occasion than on the first ; but it can be proved that either he or Brougham was in error in one instance at least, for each republished as his own the article on Parliamentary Reform which first appeared in February 1811.*

Having recorded Messrs. Waller and Glover's decision I am free to express my own opinion, which is that there is no trace of Jeffrey's manner except, possibly, in the first half of the second paragraph. For the rest, the style is no more like Jeffrey's than Hazlitt's features were like Jeffrey's ; and the ideas are as plainly Hazlitt's as the expression. In particular, the passage in which Byron is contrasted with Shakespeare is an amplification of the quotation from Pope in the Preface to the *Characters of Shakespeare*, the leading thought of which Hazlitt adopted as his own and set out to illustrate ; and the preceding remarks on Byron's egotism express in different

* See Jeffrey's *Contributions*, p. 764 in the one-volume edition ; and Brougham's *Contributions*, vol. 2, p. 347.

words the substance of Hazlitt's criticism in the *Lectures on the English Poets*. A short extract from each of these paragraphs may be compared with the authentic work of Hazlitt.

The anonymous reviewer

His Childe Harold, his Giaour, Conrad, Lara, Manfred, Cain, and Lucifer—are all one individual. There is the same varnish of voluptuousness on the surface—the same canker of misanthropy at the core, of all he touches. In personating the heroes of the scene, he does but repeat himself.

Hazlitt on the "Living Poets"

The Giaour, the Corsair, Childe Harold, are all the same person, and they are apparently all himself. . . . There is nothing more repulsive than this sort of ideal absorption of all the interests of others, of the good and ills of life, in the ruling passion and moody abstraction of a single mind. . . . It is like a cancer eating into the heart of poetry.

Hazlitt in "Conversations with Northcote," No. 14

Othello is one of the most striking and powerful inventions on the stage. But when the play closes we hear no more of him! The poet's creation comes no more to life again under a fictitious name, than the real man would have done.

Othello, Lear, Macbeth, Falstaff, are striking and original characters; but they die a natural death at the end of the fifth act, and no more come to life again than the people themselves would. He is not reduced to repeat himself or revive former inventions under feigned names.

The real internal evidence, which is to be found in the style, tone, and substance of the whole article, may be reinforced by the following collection of facts:

1. Here, as in the *Spirit of the Age*, Byron is described as "a chartered libertine."

2. There is an allusion to the speech of Touchstone, "Truly, I would the gods had made thee poetical," which Hazlitt quotes in his remarks on Burns in the *English Poets*.

3. The reviewer quotes with extreme disapproval the dialogue in which the Vicar of Wakefield, on hearing that Fletcher, Ben Jonson and Shakespeare are more in favour in London than Dryden and Rowe, speaks of the Elizabethan dramatists in very disparaging terms. Hazlitt says of Goldsmith, in the essay *On Personal Identity*: "I could never make up my mind to his preferring Rowe and Dryden to the worthies of the Elizabethan age."

4. In the *English Comic Writers* Hazlitt says of Farquhar's observations on the dramatic unities: "This criticism preceded Dennis's remarks on that subject, in his strictures on Mr. Addison's 'Cato,' and completely anticipates all that Dr. Johnson has urged so unanswerably on the subject." The reviewer of *Sardanapalus* says: "For ourselves, we will confess that we have had a consider-

able contempt for these same Unities, ever since we read Dennis's criticism on Cato in our boyhood. . . . Dr. Johnson, we conceive, has pretty well settled this question."

5. The reviewer refers ironically to "the candour and liberality" displayed by the *Quarterly Review* in its treatment of Lady Morgan. In the *Spirit of the Age* Hazlitt says that Gifford is understood to contribute "the chivalrous spirit and the attacks on Lady Morgan."

It is probable that Jeffrey was misled by the proximity of the article to a review of *Marino Faliero*, to which his claim is indisputable. In Jeffrey's *Contributions* part of this review is incorporated in the review of *Sardanapalus*, so that the article in the final form in which he left it is compounded of two elements.

Moore's "Lalla Rookh" (E.R. vol. 29)

This article, like the one last considered, was included by Jeffrey in his republished *Contributions*, but I believe that his claim to it cannot be sustained. I do not think that any one will recognise Jeffrey's style, or will fail to recognise Hazlitt's, in this extract, which, irrespective of its style, embodies the principle by which Hazlitt judged every work of art from the Elgin marbles to Martin's pictures, and which underlies his criticism of Moore in his acknowledged writings :

No work, consisting of many pages, should have detached and distinguishable beauties in every one of them. No great work, indeed, should have *many* beauties : If it were perfect, it would have but *one*, and that but faintly perceptible, except on a view of the whole. Look, for example, at what is perhaps the most finished and exquisite production of human art—the design and elevation of a Grecian temple, in its old severe simplicity. What penury of ornament—what neglect of beauties of detail ! —what masses of plain surface—what rigid economical limitation to the useful and the necessary ! The cottage of a peasant is scarcely more simple in its structure, and has not fewer parts that are superfluous. Yet what grandeur—what elegance—what grace and completeness in the effect ! The whole is beautiful—because the beauty is in the whole.

In the succeeding paragraph a quotation from *Hudibras*, in Hazlitt's customary manner, is followed by this sentence : "No one would like to make an entire meal on *sauce piquante* ; or to appear in a coat crusted over with diamonds ; or to pass a day in a steam of rich distilled perfumes." The comparison of Moore's poetry to *sauce piquante* is certainly not foreign to the mind of Hazlitt, for the same thought is suggested to him in the *English Comic Writers* by

Garrick's acting and in *Table Talk* by Cobbett's American Letters. It appears again in the article on "Moore and Byron" considered in the third of these notes. "Our indolent, luxurious bard," says the writer, referring to Moore, "does not whet the appetite by setting us to hunt after the game of human passion, and is therefore obliged to pamper us with dainties, seasoned with rich fancy and the *sauce piquante* of poetic diction."

The significance of this expression is strongly reinforced by the mention in the same sentence of "a steam of rich distilled perfumes." Here, it will be observed, the writer is thinking of a line in *Comus*: "Rose like a steam of rich distill'd Perfumes." From *Lalla Rookh* to *Comus* is not an easy or obvious transition, but Hazlitt has effected it in an acknowledged work. "His volumes," he says of Moore in the *Spirit of the Age*, "present us with 'a perpetual feast of nectar'd sweets'—but we cannot add—'where no crude surfeit reigns.'"

Another of Hazlitt's favourite quotations: "Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto," appears in the form of an allusion to "the wise antient who observed, that being a man himself, he could not but take an interest in everything that related to man."

There remain two fragments of evidence, each infinitesimal in itself but of some value as a contribution to cumulative effect. The reviewer illustrates one of his objections to *Lalla Rookh* thus:

To make us aware of the altitude of a mountain, it is absolutely necessary to show us the plain from which it ascends. If we are allowed to see nothing but *the table land* at the top, the effect will be no greater than if we had remained on the humble level of the shore.

In the first of the *Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* the same thought occurs, resolved into a metaphor. "He, indeed," says Hazlitt, speaking of Shakespeare, "overlooks and commands the admiration of posterity, but he does it from the *table land* of the age in which he lived." The second fragment is to be found in this passage:

His works are not only of rich materials and graceful design, but they are everywhere glistening with small beauties and transitory inspirations—sudden flashes of fancy that blaze out and perish; like earth-born meteors that crackle in the lower sky.

Hazlitt's study of Moore in the *Spirit of the Age* leads to the same thought:

A poem is to resemble an exhibition of fireworks, with a continual explosion of quaint figures and devices, flash after flash, that surprise for the moment, and leave no trace of light or warmth behind them.

The last paragraph, which has a strongly personal note, is certainly Jeffrey's, but we know from his own statements as well as Lord Cockburn's that Jeffrey regularly revised and amplified the work of his contributors. It would not be surprising to discover that the two short paragraphs on p. 5, beginning, "We are aware that—" and "In the *first* place—" were interpolated by the editor, especially as the substance of the argument is expressed in very similar language in Jeffrey's review of Crabbe's poem, *The Borough*. It is probable, also, that in the paragraph beginning, "We have carried this speculation, we believe, a little too far—" an earlier version has been curtailed and re-written. For the rest, so far as I can judge, there is no part of the article which has not the general appearance of Hazlitt's work, or which would not do credit to his authorship.

Melmoth the Wanderer (E.R. vol. 35)

I cannot discover that this article has been claimed by any writer of the period. The evidence set out below will not convince the severely sceptical, but the article appears to me so evidently Hazlitt's in manner and substance that I feel justified in suggesting it for consideration on that ground alone.

1. In his criticism of Moore, both in the *English Poets* and in the *Spirit of the Age*, Hazlitt borrows part of his condemnatory language from the passage in *King John* containing the lines,

To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
To throw a perfume on the violet.

The reviewer of *Melmoth* evidently had the same passage in mind, as well as Hazlitt's favourite line of the *Essay on Man*, when he wrote of Moore :

We were compelled, in our review of his *Lalla Rookh*, . . . to point out the excessive finery, the incessant sparkle and efflorescence by which the attention of the reader was fatigued, and his senses overcome. He rouged his roses, and poured perfume upon his jessamines, until we fainted under the oppression of beauty and odour, and were ready to "die of a rose in aromatic pain."

2. By an unexpected transition of thought, the novelist and dramatist Maturin is compared to the artist Fuseli, with whom

Hazlitt was on intimate terms. "The artist," says the reviewer, "whom we are now considering has no quiescent figures: even his repose is a state of rigid tension, if not extravagant distortion. He is the Fuseli of novelists." This is precisely in Hazlitt's manner. "Mr. Fuseli's conversation," he says in the *Plain Speaker*, "is more striking and extravagant, but less pleasing and natural. . . . You are sensible of effort without any repose—no careless pleasantry—no traits of character or touches from nature—everything is laboured or overdone. His ideas are gnarled, hard, and distorted, like his features."

3. The line from *Othello*, "On horror's head horrors accumulate," quoted by the reviewer, does not belong to the common stock of quotations from which all writers of the period were free to help themselves. Hazlitt uses it in the *English Poets*, though without the formality of inverted commas, when he speaks of "the unceasing accumulation of horrors on horror's head" in the poetry of Byron.

4. The reviewer describes a method of literary expression "which alone has enabled a great living purveyor of 'twopenny trash' to retain a certain portion of popularity." Hazlitt, in the *Spirit of the Age*, speaks of Cobbett as "the Editor of the Political Register (the *twopenny trash*, as it was called, till a Bill passed the House to raise the price to sixpence)."

5. The reviewer mentions the Shipwreck scene in *Don Juan*, in which the tutor is sacrificed to provide food for the rest of the party. The reviewer of *Sardanapalus* goes out of his way to refer to the same scene, though *Don Juan* is not the work with which he is primarily concerned.

Leigh Hunt's "Story of Rimini" (*E.R.* vol. 26)

Messrs. Waller and Glover admitted the force of the external evidence for this article, but objected that the article itself "does not read like Hazlitt." Lockhart wrote of it in *Blackwood* (October 1817) as the work of Hunt's partner in the *Round Table*, and there is no other review to which Hazlitt could have referred when he wrote to Leigh Hunt in 1821: "I praised you in the *Edinburgh*." Against this testimony the fact that the article is included in the list of Jeffrey's contributions published by Lord Cockburn has very little weight. In the last paragraph, at least, Hazlitt's manner is clearly apparent. The article as a whole consists very largely of quotations; but there is nothing in it incompatible with the supposition that it was compiled by Hazlitt in the intervals between inspired moments.

DRAYTON'S DEBT TO GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH

By I. GOURVITCH

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- C. Camden, *Britannia*, etc., 1586, etc.
G.M. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Britonum*, ed. by J. A. Giles, 1844.
H. Holland, *Britain*, etc., trans. and augmented by P. Holland, 1610.
Hol. Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 1587.
M. Malory, *Arthur, King of Britain*, ed. by Prof. Rhys, 1909.
P. Drayton, *Polyolbion*.

OF the various books read by Michael Drayton in his search for material—particularly history and legend—wherewith to embellish his great patriotic work, *The Polyolbion*, not the least interesting was the *Historia Britonum* of Geoffrey of Monmouth.* Purporting to give the history of the Britons from the arrival of Brutus to the triumph of the Saxons over Cadwallader, the *Historia* became a source of much that subsequently appeared in literature. Therein, shadowy figures are depicted as living personages side by side with characters of historic authenticity; and an equal air of verisimilitude is given to matter as varied in its nature as the stories of Brutus and his followers, the tragic episodes connected with the daughters of Leir or with Ferrex and Porrex, the sons of Gorbogudo, the events relating to Julius Caesar and the Roman conquest of Britain, the coming of Hengest and Horsa, the legends associated with Arthur, and the prophecies and wondrous doings of Merlin. Though the veracity of its statements was immediately assailed by some writers,† the *Historia* was accepted for centuries as an established authority by chroniclers and historians, whose writings abound with references to it; but, apart from its historical content, Geoffrey's work would have secured him a niche in the Temple of Fame,‡ if only for the invaluable material presented by its Arthurian legends.

* Dedicated to Robert, Duke of Gloucester, who died 1147.

† Giraldus Cambrensis and William of Newburgh are the most prominent; the latter declares Geoffrey's work to consist of "impudent and shameless lies."

‡ Chaucer gives Geoffrey a place in his *House of Fame* for his legends of Brutus.

In exploring this promising field, Drayton could hardly fail to enrich his store, and his efforts were well repaid by his acquisitions, bearing as they did directly upon his enterprise—the glorification of his native land. However, with regard to the historical and legendary matter of the *Polyolbion*, it is not always possible to state definitely upon which of his sources Drayton based his own versions. Many of the episodes there presented are to be found—at times curtailed or amplified—not only in the *Historia Britonum*, but also in one or more of the works of Camden, Holland, Holinshed, and others, who frequently acknowledge their indebtedness to Geoffrey. To compile the enormous mass of material necessary for the completion of his task, Drayton began by reading carefully Camden's *Britannia*, and probably also the translation of that work by Philemon Holland.* Thence he gathered a vast quantity of topographical, historical, and legendary matter. This he proceeded to supplement from other sources, particularly in connection with that portion of his scheme dealing with history and legend. Thus it was that he delved into the *Historia*, where he found a mine of information most useful for his purpose. Besides the early history of Britain, there were several legends, already suggested

* A number of facts contained in the *Polyolbion* from Song 1 on are to be found both in the 1607 edition of Camden and in Holland's translation, but not in the earlier Latin editions of Camden himself. Examples in Song 1 are:

1. Of Jethow, one of the Channel Islands:

As Jethow, them at need,
With pheasants, fallow deer, and conies that dost feed: 55-56.

2. Of Falmouth.

That in her quiet bay a hundred ships may ride,
Yet not the tallest mast be of the tall'st descry'd. 165-166.

That Drayton was familiar with Holland is attested by his occasional borrowing of words or phrases from the English translation. Thus, of one of the Two Holy Springs of Harlweston, Drayton uses the term *brackish* and says it had the power to cure *the dimness of the sight* (Song 22, 59-62). Camden's words are *salus* and *illum contra oculorum hebetudinem valere*, which might have been rendered into English in various ways, but Drayton has taken his terms from Holland's translation, part of which reads: "The other *brackish* . . . good . . . against *the dimness of the eyesight*," p. 497.

Although Holland's translation was not entered in the Stationers' Registers until June 4, 1610, part was done before 1603, since on p. 516 of his work he states, "And while I was writing and perusing this Worke, our most Sacred Sovereigne King James in the yeere . . . 1603, upon one and the same day advanced Lord Henry Howard," etc. Considering that the first eighteen songs of the *Polyolbion* were entered at the Stationers' Hall as early after June 1610 as February 7, 1612, it is not impossible that Drayton saw that work, as well as the additions introduced by Camden into his 1607 edition, whilst they were yet in manuscript form.

to him by Camden and Holland, set out in greater detail, as, for instance, those of Brut, Arthur, Merlin, and Sabrina.

In the realm of history, Camden and Holland supplied Drayton with fairly detailed accounts of the arrival and settlement of Brutus and his followers, of the druids and bards, of the Roman conquest, and of the coming of the Saxons. Particularly graphic are such incidents as the capture of Anglesea by Suetonius, or the resistance of Voadicia. The whole of this history of the early British kings and the Roman invasion is narrated by Drayton in the *Polyolbion* in Song 8 ; * and whilst the foundation furnished by Camden may have been supplemented by a use of Geoffrey's narrative of the events, it seems most probable that for this portion of his work Drayton relied mainly on the History of Holinshed, from the fourth chapter of the Third Book and on through most of the Fourth Book. Here it is difficult to discover evidence that will establish a direct use of Geoffrey rather than of others ; but, with regard to the legends, the problem is on a somewhat different footing, as there are elements in the *Polyolbion* that appear to be derived solely from the *Historia*. Thus, the Sabrina legend recounted by Drayton † appears definitely to have emanated from that source. There we read how Locrine, "Brute's first begotten son," fell in love with Elstred, who bore him a daughter. His deserted wife, Gwendoin, further enraged by the fact that

Her father, Cornwall's duke, great Corineus dead,
(She) Was by the lustful king unjustly banished,

determines to be revenged.

To Cornwall then she sends (her Country) for supplies :
Which all at once in arms with Gwendolin arise.
Then with her warlike power her husband she pursu'd,
Whom his unlawful love too vainly did delude.

The fierce and jealous queen, then void of all remorse,
As great in power as spirit, whilst he neglects her force,
Him suddainly surpriz'd, and from her ireful heart
All pity clean exil'd (whom nothing could convert)
The son of mighty Brute bereaved of his life.

Then "Madan—whom she to Locrine bore" is crowned king, and Elstred and her child Sabrina are pitilessly cast into the waters of the Severn and drowned, the river henceforward bearing the maiden's name. Both Camden and Holland ‡ refer to the legend, but only

* Lines 29-384.

† P. vi. 130-178.

‡ C. p. 381 ; H. p. 661. Note that the pages quoted for Camden are from the 1586 edition, unless otherwise stated.

very briefly, and then merely to give the origin of the name *Severn*; neither relates the episode in detail as does Geoffrey.* Grafton,† it is true, does quote the story in detail, except that, in his version, *Sabren* appears as *Habren*. However, in connection with the legends of Brut, Arthur, and Merlin, Grafton, like others, omits many of the details given by Geoffrey and incorporated in the *Polyolbion* by Drayton. Again, he places the struggle between Corineus and Gogmagog at Dover as does Holinshed ‡ but not Geoffrey or Drayton. Hence, it would hardly accord with the evidence to assume that Drayton had made use of Grafton solely for the *Sabrina* legend.

More space, however, is devoted by Camden and Holland § to the story of Brut and his compatriots; but again, as in Holinshed and other historians,|| some of the details or personages mentioned by Drayton ¶ are missing. On the other hand, all are in the *Historia*,** and that it was the *Historia* that Drayton was then using and not the works of later writers with their discrepancies is cogently attested by the closeness with which the *Polyolbion* at times follows Geoffrey's Latin—almost being but a loose poetical translation, as the following extracts may show:

1. Of Brutus after accidentally killing his father, Geoffrey has

Exulans ergo adivit Græciam: invenitque progeniem Heleni filii Priami, quæ sub potestate Pandrasi Græcorum regis in servitutem tenebatur. Pyrrhus etenim Achillis filius post Trojæ eversionem, prædictum Helenum compluresque alios secum in vinculis adduxerat. Et ut necem patris in ipsos vindicaret, in captione teneri præceperat.

i. 3.

Who wand'ring in the world, to Greece at last doth get,
Where whilst he liv'd unknown, and oft with want beset,
He of the race of Troy a remnant hapt to find,
There by the Grecians held; which (having still in mind
Their tedious ten years war, and famous heroes slain)
In slavery with them still those Trojans did detain;
Which Pyrrhus thither brought, (& did with hate pursue,
To wreak Achilles' death, at Troy whom Paris slew)
There by Pandrasus kept in sad and servile awe: †† P. i. 345-353.

* G.M. ii. 2, 3, 4, 5.

† Grafton, *Chronicle*, Fourth Part, pp. 29-30.

‡ The same, p. 25; and see Note *, p. 399.

§ C. pp. 4-7; H. pp. 5-6.

¶ P. i. 310-306.

|| Hol. ii. 1, 2, 3, 4.

** G.M. i. 3-17.

†† The names Pyrrhus and Achilles are not given by Camden or Holland; they are mentioned in Holinshed, but not with the idea of revenge and captivity as in both Drayton and Geoffrey. Holinshed's words simply record the fact: "For Pyrrhus the son of Achilles, . . . married Andromache, late wife of Hector, and by her had three sonnes," etc. (ii. 1).

2. Of Corineus,

Sed et confestim irruens in cæteros, bipennem rotans, stragem
acerrimam facit, et nunc hac nunc illac discurrens ictus recipere diffugit,
nec hostes prosternere quiescit. G.M. i. 13.

... Where Corineus ran
With slaughter through the thick-set squadrons of the foes,
And with his armed axe laid on such deadly blows,
That heaps of lifeless trunks each passage stopp'd up quite.

P. i. 446-449.

3. Of Turon,

Erat ibi quidam Tros nomine Turonus Bruti nepos, quo fortior sive
audacior nullus, excepto Corineo, aderat. Hic solus solo gladio suo
sexcentos viros peremit. Sed ab irruentibus Gallis citius quam debuisset
interfectus est. De nomine ipsius prædicta civitas Turonis vocabulum
nacta est. G.M. i. 15.

Where Turon (of the rest) Brute's sister's valiant son
(By whose approved deeds that day was chiefly won)
Six hundred slew outright through his peculiar strength :
By multitudes of men yet over-press'd at length.
His nobler uncle there to his immortal name,
The city Turon built.*

P. i. 459-464.

Adopting the course he was to pursue time and again throughout
the thirty songs, Drayton places the story of Brut in the mouth of the
River Dert, which, to proclaim the merits of Dertmoor, begins

Dear mother, from your breast this fear (quothe she) remove ;
Defy their utmost force ; there's not the proudest flood,
That falls betwixt the Mount and Exmoor, shall make good
Her royalty with mine, with me nor can compare :
I challenge any one to answer me that dare ;
That was, before them all, predestinate to meet
My Britain-founding Brute, when with his puissant fleet
At Totness first he touch'd ;

i. 304-311.

The story, thus introduced, relates Brut's descent from Æneas of
Troy, his "fatal flight from Greece," his numerous adventures,
"and his fortunate arrive in happy Albion." There he is opposed
by the race of giants inhabiting Cornwall ; but, after the victory of
Corineus over Gogmagog, Brut establishes a kingdom,

Where from the stock of Troy, those puissant kings should rise,
Whose conquests from the West, the world should scant suffice.

The wrestling match between Corineus and Gogmagog is fittingly
linked up with the West Country, where the sports of hurling and
wrestling were assiduously practised. Carew, whose book on Corn-
wall was read by Drayton,† has no less than six pages on these

* The number 600 is not mentioned by either Holinshed or Grafton.

† P. i. 217.

athletic pursuits. It is to be noted at this point that whilst in the *Polyolbion*, as in Camden and Holland, the titanic struggle between Corineus and the giant takes place at Plymouth Hoe, in Holinshed's *Historie of England** the scene of the contest is placed "not farre from Dover," a fact that to some extent counters the possibility that Drayton based his stories of Brut and Corineus upon that work.

The legends associated with King Arthur are reproduced in the *Polyolbion* chiefly in Songs 1, 3, and 4: † in the first of these, ‡ the River Camel, to declare her worth, refers briefly to Arthur's death at "Mordred's murtherous hand," when his blood "was mingled with her flood," and to his "twelve proud fields against the Saxon fought," and concludes with the lament,

time upon my waste committed hath such theft,
That it of Arthur here scarce memory hath left.

The Third Song has two passages appertaining to Arthur; the first treats of his tomb at Glastonbury; § the second, of Camelot, the Round Table at Caerleon, and the sports held at Pentecost. || In both these songs, 1 and 3, Drayton probably derived his material from Holland or Camden, where descriptions are given of Arthur's death, ¶ his tomb, ** and of Camelot with its ruined castle, reputed to be King Arthur's Palace. †† The longest section, however, devoted to Arthur by Drayton, that in Song 4, bears testimony to the use of Geoffrey; there, with the exception of a few lines dealing with the establishment of the Round Table and Arthur's triumph over Rython, the narrative is merely a summary of the episodes

* Hol. ii. 4. Geoffrey does not actually mention Plymouth Hoe, but states that the encounter between the followers of Brut and those of Goëmagot took place "in portu quo applicuerat," which was Totnes, not Dover. Further, in the same chapter he adds that Corineus found it "a diversion . . . to encounter with the Giants" of Cornwall, and finally overcame Goëmagot, hurling him from the "Top of a high Rock" (i. 16).

† Brief references to Arthur occur also in Songs 6, 8, and 19. Song 6, 269-274, gives the supposed discovery of Arthur's tomb in the reign of Henry II; Song 8, 371-374, Arthur's connection with the Trojan race; and Song 19, 163-168, recapitulates his conquests overseas.

‡ P. i. 181-202.

§ P. iii. 288-314.

|| P. iii. 395-406.

¶ C. pp. 76-77; H. pp. 194-195.

** C. pp. 98-99; H. p. 221.

†† The Round Table is mentioned by Camden, p. 109, and by Holland, p. 265, to refute the belief that a table at Winchester Castle was that used by Arthur and his knights. Malory tells of the institution of the Round Table in Book iii. 1, etc.

recounted by the *Historia*.^{*} As with much of the matter worked into the texture of his songs, Drayton is compelled by the extent of his task to reduce the contents of more than two books of his original—comprising thirty-five chapters—to the small compass of seventy-seven lines.[†] In rapid succession, he scans the main incidents in Arthur's life presented by Geoffrey, adding thereto a few details acquired possibly from Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. So the passage declares "the richness of the arms" borne by the hero,

The temper of his sword (the try'd Escalabour)
The bigness and the length of Rone, his noble spear ;
With Fridwin and his great shield, and what the proof could bear ;
His Baudrick how adorn'd with stone of wond'rous price,
The sacred virgin's shape he bore for his device.

His victories over the Saxons at Lincoln and

. . . at Badon . . . that day,
When at the glorious gole his British scepter lay :
Two days together how the battle strongly stood :
Pendragon's worthy son, who waded there in blood,
Three hundred Saxons slew with his own valiant hand.

His victories over the Picts and Irish in Albania and Ireland ; his conquests in Gothland, Iceland, Orkney, Norway, and Denmark,

That scarcely there was found a country to the pole
That dreaded not his deeds, too long that were to tell.

His overthrow of the "mighty Flollio" in the lists at Paris ; the institution of the Round Table and its knights ;

The Pentecosts prepar'd at Carleon in his court,
That table's ancient seat ; her temples and her groves,
Her palaces, her walks, baths, theatres, and stoves :
Her academy, then, as likewise they † prefer :
Of Camilot they sing, and then of Winchester.
The feasts that under-ground the Faëry did him make,
And there how he enjoy'd the lady of the lake.

The defeat of Lucius in France, his victory over the giant Rython, his twelve battles with the Saxons, and his death. §

^{*} P. iv. 245-322 ; G.M. ix. x. xi. 2.

[†] Compare the *Brut* episodes above ; given by Geoffrey in the course of fourteen chapters, they are reduced by Drayton to 196 lines.

[‡] The Britons who are recounting the deeds of their hero. Geoffrey deals with Pentecost, the court at the City of Legions, the meadows and groves, the royal palaces, the churches, and the local college in Book ix. 12. Drayton follows him fairly closely with regard to the facts, but adds lines on the Round Table, and the feasts with the Faëry, taken probably from Malory.

[§] A repetition of facts already given in Songs 1 and 3 ; there, they were presented in a geographical setting, but here they are given in association with the general account of Arthur's life.

Concerning these episodes, it should be noted that, whereas in the *Historia* Arthur is said to have slain four hundred and seventy men with Caliburn, in the lines quoted the number is reduced to three hundred; moreover, in making Arthur kill Rytho, the ravisher of Howell's niece Helena, and carry off that giant's coat made of the beards of kings,* Drayton has either confused two episodes in Geoffrey or is using Malory as his source. For according to the *Historia*, Helena's captor, a giant coming from Spain, carries her to the top of the Mount of Michael; there, on his attempting to embrace her, she faints and expires, whilst the giant Ritho is slain by Arthur on Mount Aravius. Geoffrey leaves no doubt about the distinction between the two giants, as after his account of the defeat of Helena's assailant, he adds:

Rex illico in risum solutus, præcepit Beduero amputare ei caput, et dare uni armigerorum ad deferendum ad castra, ut spectaculum intuentibus fieret. Præcepit intuentibus fieri silentium: dicebat autem se non invenisse alium tantæ virtutis, postquam Rithonem gigantem in Aravio monte interfecit, qui eum ad prælium invitaverat. Hic namque ex barbis regum quos peremerat, fecerat sibi pelles, etc. G.M. x. 3.

Malory's version relates how Helena, Duchess of Brittany, and wife of Howell (not his niece as in Drayton) is ravished by a giant who

hath vanquished fifteen kings and hath made him a coat full of precious stones embroidered with their beards, which they sent him to have his love for salvation of their people at this last Christmas. . . . This was the fiercest giant that ever I met with, save one in the Mount of Araby, which I overcame, but this was greater and fiercer. M. v. 5.

Thus, although there are two giants also mentioned in Malory, the account differs from that of Geoffrey in that the ravisher of Helena is identified with the beard-gathering king, as is the case in the *Polyolbion*. The name of Ritho does not appear at all in Malory, but another beard-gatherer appears early in the *Morte d'Arthur* in the person of Rience, King of North Wales, of Ireland, and of many isles.† Here undue importance, however, must not be given to Malory, since the facts possibly borrowed from his work and incorporated in the passage in question form less than a fifth of the whole, the rest being certainly based on the *Historia*, as I have shown.

Malory, again, was the source whence Drayton appears to have got the story of Merlin's fate at the hand of a fairy. Thus, in the

* P. iv. 315-318.

† M. i. 26. There is nothing to identify Rience with Ritho.

Morte d'Arthur we read that Merlin fell under the spell of love for "one of the damosels of the lake, that hight Nimue." In the end, she learnt all she could of him and caused him to go under an enchanted stone "to let her wit of the marvels there, but she wrought so there for him that he came never out for all the craft he could do. And so she departed and left Merlin." * This is reproduced in the *Polyolbion* as follows :

. . . by loving of an elf
(For all his wond'rous skill) was cozen'd by himself.
For, walking with his Fay, her to the rock he brought,
In which he oft before his nigromancies wrought ;
And going in thereat his magicks to have shown,
She stopt the cavern's mouth with an enchanted stone ;
Whose cunning strongly cross'd, amaz'd whilst he did stand,
She captive him convey'd unto the Fairy land. P. iv. 335-342.

The account of Merlin's birth at Caermarden may have been derived from Camden, Holland, or Geoffrey ; † but it is Geoffrey's work alone that provides the origin of Merlin's prophecies foretelling the loss of Britain by Vortiger, who was to be deposed by the Saxons ; of the desire of the king to build a "strong-wall'd tower" ; and of Merlin causing the mountain to gape and disclose the struggle between the white and the red serpents. ‡ Here, again, Drayton's method of compression is well illustrated, as the contents of three chapters of the *Historia* are condensed to no more than fourteen lines. § Geoffrey also gives a comprehensive account of Merlin's skill, displayed in connection with the erection of Stonehenge, || which King Aurelius Ambrosius set up as a memorial to the British treacherously slain by Hengist and his followers ; however, Drayton may have had the salient facts from Camden or Holland. ¶ The same may be said of the foundation of Shaftesbury and of the Eagle's Prophecy ** foretelling the restoration of the British line after the Saxon conquest, of the legendary origin of the name of the River Humber, †† and of the episode of the eleven thousand maidens sent to help restore the fullness of numbers to the depleted ranks of the British race in Armorica during the rule of Conan. ‡‡ These

* M. iv. 1.

† P. v. 159-174 ; C. p. 371 ; H. p. 649 ; G.M. vi. 17, 18.

‡ G.M. vi. 18 ; viii. 1.

§ P. x. 23-37.

|| P. iv. 329-330 ; viii. 357-362 ; G.M. viii. 10, 11, 12.

¶ C. pp. 119-120 ; H. pp. 251-253.

** P. ii. 150-160 ; G.M. xii. 18 ; C. p. 93 ; H. p. 214.

†† P. xxviii. 466 ; G.M. ii. 1, 2 ; C. p. 414 ; H. p. 711.

‡‡ P. viii. 366-369 ; G.M. v. 15, 16 ; C. pp. 78, 142, 143 ; H. pp. 197, 286.

are all in Geoffrey, Camden, and Holland; whilst, in addition, the legends of the Humber and the maidens are also to be found in Holinshed and other historians.* Still, it is not to be overlooked that in these instances, as in most of the facts dealt with in the course of this paper, Geoffrey was generally the source drawn upon by the rest.

Drayton's indebtedness to the *Historia* was therefore twofold: both directly and indirectly, as the evidence amply testifies, it provided him with a mass of material bearing upon the early history of his country, as well as additional or corroborative detail for the legends with which he adorned his songs. And so it was that Drayton constructed the whole of his literary edifice: from the foregoing and other authorities such as Hakluyt,† Gerard,‡ Humphrey Llwyd,§ and Giraldus Cambrensis,|| he accumulated that extensive and varied freight of encyclopædic information with which he filled the framework—mainly geographical in character—supplied him at the outset by Camden or Holland. Like the romance episodes of Bevis of Hampton¶ and Guy of Warwick,** the additional facts impart colour and movement and, at times, a good deal of vigour and interest to the songs, and they may yet serve to rescue the bulky *Polyolbion* from the sea of oblivion, which has long threatened to engulf it.

* Hol. *Des. of Brit.*, 15; *Hist. of Eng.*, iv. 30; Grafton, *Chronicle*, pp. 29 and 71.

† *Principall Navigations*, etc., 1589. See Drayton and the Voyagers, by R. R. Cawley, in *Publications*, Mod. Lang. Ass. Amer., September 1923.

‡ *The Herball*, etc., 1597.

§ *The Historie of Cambria*, trans. by Llwyd and augmented by Powel, 1584. See my paper on "The Welsh Element in the Polyolbion," *R.E.S.*, January 1928, and "Drayton's Use of Welsh History," by R. R. Cawley, in *Studies in Philology*, April 1925.

|| *Anglia, Hibernia, Normandia, Cambria . . . Giraldus Cambrensis . . . etc.*, Camdeni, 1602.

¶ P. ii. 260-380.

** P. xii. 129-334; xiii. 327-352.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *SQUIRE TRELOOBY*

BY JOHN C. HODGES

ALTHOUGH it has been generally known that Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh collaborated in the adaptation of Molière's *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, entitled *Squire Trelooby** in the English version, all but one of the editors of these writers have omitted the play, apparently from a lack of confidence in the authenticity of the extant versions.† It remained for Mr. Montague Summers to include in his *Complete Works of William Congreve* ‡ the anonymous *Squire Trelooby* of 1704, on the ground that it represents essentially the work of the three collaborators. Before the play thus printed is finally accepted as a part of the Congreve canon, the question of authorship should have further consideration.§

The play was first brought to the attention of the public by an advertisement in *The Daily Courant* for Thursday, March 30, 1704,

* The leading character in the English version, *Squire Trelooby*, is represented as a native of Cornwall, and the name is derived, no doubt, from the Cornish mining term *treloobing*, the act of "stirring and working the loobs, or slimy earth of tin, in a slime-pit, that the mud may partly wash off with the water and the ore settle at the bottom" (*Century Dictionary*). The name *Trelooby* might well have been suggested by Congreve as a result of his friendship with Walter Moyle, a native of Cornwall, to whom we find Congreve writing on August 13, 1695, Moyle at that time being absent from his London friends to conduct his campaign for a seat in Parliament. In the letter Congreve refers incidentally to the Cornish miners. See *The Whole Works of Walter Moyle, Esq.* (London, 1727), pp. 227-229.

† See, for example, C. W. Ward, *Sir John Vanbrugh* (London, 1893), I, 1-111.

‡ Issued from the Nonesuch Press in four volumes, London, 1923. *Squire Trelooby* is included in the third volume, pp. 111-158.

§ The reviewers of Mr. Summers's edition of Congreve have very generally accepted the inclusion of *Squire Trelooby* without protest. Mr. Allardyce Nicoll, however, in *The Year's Work in English Studies* for 1923, p. 154, asserts that "there is not a whit of evidence to associate Congreve with the quarto as printed, indeed he himself, in a letter, disowned it; contemporaries were quite well aware that it was not his. Its inclusion in Mr. Summers's edition, therefore, can be allowed only on sufferance, and future biographers of Congreve should call attention to the fact that the printed quarto in all probability has nothing to do with Congreve whatsoever." This statement is not altogether consistent with Mr. Nicoll's praise (*The Year's Work in English Studies* for 1924, p. 189) of Sir Edmund Gosse's "eminently careful and discriminating" discussion of the *Squire Trelooby* puzzle, for Sir Edmund Gosse (*Life of Congreve* (London, 1924), p. 137) is "not at all certain . . . that this *Squire Trelooby* of 1704 does not virtually represent" the work of Congreve and his two collaborators.

announcing "a new Farce, never acted before, call'd, *Squire Trelooby*," to be performed "at the New Theatre in *Little-Lincolns-Inn-Fields*." The advertisement did not name the writers of the farce, but the authorship was assigned to Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh by John Downes,* whose intimate association with the London theatres—he was prompter at the time the play was acted—would almost certainly have given him reliable information; and even more conclusively by Congreve himself, in a letter † written within two months of the first production of the play. The same authorship was affirmed by James Ralph thirty years later, with the additional statement that "so great were the Expectations from it, that the Pit and Boxes were laid together at Half a Guinea, and the Gallery at a Crown." ‡ The popularity of the piece was also attested by the fact that two of the actresses chose it later in the same year for their benefit performances. §

Three weeks after *Squire Trelooby* was first brought on the stage, a play with the same title was published anonymously, with the following explanation in the preface:

The Author of the following Sheets has to acquaint the Reader that they contain an entire Translation, *mutatis mutandis*, of Mons. de *Pourceaugnac*, one of *Moliere's* best Pieces, and design'd for the English Stage, had he not been prevented by a Translation of the same Play, done by other Hands, and presented at the New Play-house the 30th. of last Month. When I was told the great Names concern'd in the exhibiting of it to so glorious an Assembly, and saw what Choice was made of the Comedians, I was so far from thinking my Time ill spent upon studying this Play, that I presently resolv'd upon the Publication of it. I call this an entire Translation because the other that was play'd was not so; there being omitted, the long Debate of the two Doctors in the eighth Scene of the first Act; entirely and also the eleventh scene of the second Act, between *Trelooby* and the Lawyers; which being noted, I think I have justify'd the Title Page of this Play, wherein I say, acted at the Playhouse in *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*, &c. unless it can be shewn me that the other was any thing else but a Translation, which no body can say that ever read *Pourceaugnac* before they saw *Trelooby*. . . . *Squire Trelooby* of *Penzance*

* See *Roscius Anglicanus* (London, 1886), p. 49. Although *Squire Trelooby* was staged at the theatre controlled by the Betterton group, the actors of the Drury Lane company assisted in the production. See *The Daily Courant* for April 21, 1704.

† Summers, *op. cit.*, i. 76.

‡ See the preface to *The Cornish Squire*, London, 1734.

§ Mrs. Bracegirdle and Mrs. Lee. See *The Daily Courant* for May 22 and June 5, 1704.

in the County of *Cornwall*, is proper English enough for Monsieur *Pourceaunac* of *Limoges* in the Province of *Gascony*, &c.*

This preface, we see, is the writer's explanation that the printed version of *Monsieur de Pourceaunac* is his own, not that of the "great Names," although he admits that he had made free to rename the characters according to those of the acted play—*Trelooby* of *Penzance* in *Cornwall* for *Pourceaunac* of *Limoges* in *Gascony*, etc.—and to call the play the one acted, since both were mere translations of the same French farce. The changes mentioned are only such as could easily have been made by any one attending the performance on March 30.

That the preface to the anonymous *Squire Trelooby* contains a statement of fact is borne out by Congreve's letter of May 20, 1704, to Joseph Keally, an intimate friend living in Ireland :

The translation you speak of is not altogether mine ; for Vanbrugh and Walsh had a part in it. Each did an act of a French farce. Mine, and I believe theirs, was done in two mornings ; so there can be no great matter in it. It was a compliment made to the people of quality at their subscription music, without any design to have it acted or printed farther. It made people laugh ; and somebody thought it worth his while to translate it again, and print it as it was acted : but if you meet such a thing, I assure you it was none of ours ; which I don't think will appear again after next week, when our neighbor is to have it acted for her benefit.†

The *Squire Trelooby* in which Congreve had a part was not printed—if we may believe James Ralph—until 1734. In that year Ralph published under the title of *The Cornish Squire* an adaptation of Molière's *Monsieur de Pourceaunac*, which he attributed to Vanbrugh, with the assistance of Congreve and Walsh, "each of them being suppos'd to have done an Act a piece." He added further :

How the Publication of this Piece came to be delay'd so long, or the Piece it self to be so little known, I can meet with no satisfactory Account. . . . This [manuscript] was sent to me by a Gentleman, who has had it in his Library several Years, with a Desire that I should use my Endeavours to get it represented, and publish'd : 'Tis true it had the Disadvantage of

* Summers, *op. cit.*, iii. 115. The preface is dated April 19, 1704. The play was actually published two days later, according to an advertisement in *The Daily Courant* for April 21, 1704.

† Quoted from the letter as edited by Summers, *op. cit.*, i. 76. The neighbour to whom Congreve referred was Mrs. Anne Bracegirdle, who was at that time, according to the Rate Books of the City of Westminster, a householder in Arundel Street, not far from Congreve's residence, which was either in Arundel Street or in the nearby Surrey Street. The benefit performance for Mrs. Bracegirdle was given on Monday, two days after the writing of Congreve's letter. See note § above.

being imperfect in some Places ; but these Omissions I have endeavour'd to supply in the best manner I could, and have, over and above, taken the Liberty to set aside some incidental Jokes, which were merely the growth of the Times, and could not be understood now without a Glossary. Some Inelegances at the end of the first Act are likewise alter'd, as being judg'd an Offence to Decorum, and the present delicate Taste of the Age. What beside may be thought faulty, I apprehend I am not answerable for, as being little more than an Editor, and having no Title to any part of the Applause which may arise from its Excellencies.*

The Cornish Squire of 1734 and the *Squire Trelooby* issued anonymously in 1704 are the only printed versions of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* that have been associated with Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh. If we accept the statements made in the two prefaces, we must consider *The Cornish Squire* essentially the work of the three dramatists, and *Squire Trelooby* the work of a single translator. But at least two distinguished students of Congreve feel that the prefaces should not be taken at their face value. One of these, Sir Edmund Gosse, argues as follows :

Vanbrugh, Congreve, and Walsh called their farce *Squire Trelooby* ; so does the anonymous translator, who brings the hero, as they did, from Cornwall. Pourceaugnac in the original comes from Limoges, but there is nothing in that to suggest to two independent minds Trelooby and Cornwall. Moreover, the printed play gives the prologue written by Garth and the epilogue spoken by Mrs. Bracegirdle. . . . The bill of the actors' names, too, is the genuine one, and it seems not at all certain, in spite of Congreve's cautious letter to Keally, that this *Squire Trelooby* of 1704 does not virtually represent the play which the joint authors thought it wise to disown.†

Another scholar who has taken exception to the statements in the prefaces, Mr. Montague Summers, has urged the same reasons, with the additional suggestion that the printed play " is a racy bit of work, and one of which none of the famous names concerned need have been in any way ashamed." He concludes :

Viewing the circumstances we can, I think, discern a deliberate mystification, and it is hardly open to doubt that this quarto of 1704 substantially represents the work of Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh. ‡

We may say, then, that Mr. Summers, at least, thinks the acted and printed versions of *Squire Trelooby* must be practically the same because both make use of the same title, the same characters, the same prologue and epilogue, and because the latter gives the list of

* Quoted from the preface to *The Cornish Squire*, London, 1734.

† Quoted from Gosse, *op. cit.*, pp. 136, 137.

‡ Quoted from Summers, *op. cit.*, i. 58.

actors that actually appeared in the stage version. But these striking similarities can be explained without the assumption that the translations are one and the same: as we have already noted, the preface of the printed version accounts for the title and for the naming of the characters; and it was only natural that the writer who had felt himself justified in appropriating the title would also have tried to take advantage of the popularity of the acted play by including the prologue, epilogue, and bill of actors. We should not forget that the writer, at the same time that he acknowledges the most significant borrowings noted by Mr. Summers, asserts that the translation is his own; and that Congreve, in behalf of himself and his colleagues, clearly disowns the printed version.*

So it seems that without any further evidence than is to be had in the prefaces to *Squire Trelooby* and *The Cornish Squire* and in the denial of Congreve, we are justified in rejecting the ascription of the printed *Squire Trelooby* to Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh. Still another reason for rejecting it is the fact that the anonymous play can be definitely assigned to John Ozell, one of the most industrious translators of the first half of the eighteenth century.

Numerous references have been made, usually in a more or less indefinite way, to a translation of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* by Ozell. As early as 1764 Baker † listed, without giving any date, a *Squire Trelooby* by John Ozell, calling it "a mere Translation of *Molière's* Play, never intended for the Stage." Under a separate heading he listed the anonymous play of 1704 and identified it with the acted version of the same year. Sir Edmund Gosse, in his first edition of the *Life of Congreve*, mentioned a translation by Ozell, with the suggestion that it is possibly to be identified with *The Cornish Squire* of 1734.‡ In his second edition of the *Life*,§ he stated, as did

* Sir Edmund Gosse (*op. cit.*, p. 137) has referred to Congreve's denial as "cautious," probably with reference to the fact that some persons thought *Squire Trelooby* "a Party-Play made on purpose to ridicule the whole Body of West-Country Gentlemen, others averring that it was wrote to expose some eminent Doctors of Physick" (Preface to *Squire Trelooby*, Summers, *op. cit.*, iii. 115). Even though Congreve had been somewhat alarmed by the criticisms of the play—and we have no evidence to show that he was—it is still not clear why he should have felt any need for caution in writing to Joseph Keally, who was an intimate friend, and who was, besides, in Ireland, far removed from the centre of such criticism as the play had aroused.

† See under *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* in D. E. Baker's *The Companion to the Play-House*, etc., London, 1764.

‡ See p. 150 of the first edition of Gosse's *Life of Congreve*, London, 1888. The passage here referred to does not appear in the second edition.

§ London, 1924, p. 137.

Mr. Summers in the *Complete Works*,* that Ozell translated *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* for his complete version of Molière in 1714; but neither of these scholars has pointed out any relationship between this version of 1714 and that of 1704. On the other hand, *The Dictionary of National Biography* has included *Squire Trelooby*, 1704, among the works of Ozell, without making any reference to the Molière of 1714, and without giving any reason for ascribing the play to Ozell. Apparently no one has hitherto taken the trouble to compare the two translations, possibly because Ozell's complete Molière is now very rare.† A comparison shows that the play issued in 1704 was merely reprinted in the complete Molière of 1714. And furthermore, in a signed dedication of the later work, Ozell claimed the translation as his own,‡ and thus indirectly claimed also the anonymous *Squire Trelooby* of 1704. Still another important bit of evidence for Ozell's authorship is the inclusion of *Squire Trelooby* in a list of plays sold by Ozell to Bernard Lintott.§

The name of the publisher, Bernard Lintott, on the title-page is not without its significance. Lintott was also the publisher of the complete Molière of 1714; in fact, he was the regular publisher for Ozell's numerous translations. In the very year in which *Squire Trelooby* first appeared we find a title-page reading: "Characters Historical. . . . Now Render'd into English, by J. Ozell. . . . Printed for Bernard Lintott at the Middle-Temple-Gate in Fleetstreet, 1704." Lintott's name appears also on the title-pages of works issued by Ozell in 1705, 1709, 1710, 1711, and 1712.|| On the other

* Mr. Summers discusses in the body of his general introduction (*op. cit.*, i. 58, 59) the acted and printed versions of *Squire Trelooby*, 1704, without making any reference to Ozell. In a footnote, however, he adds, "As some doubt has been expressed with regard to John Ozell's translation of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, it may be worth while remarking that this was published in the complete version he made of Molière's Works, 6 vols., 1714."

† The British Museum does not possess Ozell's translation of Molière. The only copy I have been able to examine is in the London Library, entitled "The Works of Monsieur de Moliere. In Six Volumes. Printed for Bernard Lintott, at the Cross-Keys, between the Two Temple Gates, in Fleetstreet. MDCCXIV." *Squire Trelooby* is contained in vol. iv. 175-222.

‡ Such, I take it, is the proper interpretation of the following statement made by Ozell in his dedication of the complete Molière to the Earl of Dorset: "Before I take my leave of Your Lordship, I ought to acquaint You, that the *Misanthrope* and *Malade Imaginaire*, two of the following Plays, are translated by other Persons. . . ."

§ See John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1812-1815), viii. 299. Nichols observes in a footnote to *Squire Trelooby*, "The Author of this Comedy has hitherto been unknown."

|| *Characters Historical*, ii. (1705), *La Gitamilla* (1709), *El Zeloso Estremeno* (1709), *Mr. Le Clerc's Account*, etc. (1710), *Dialogue upon Colouring* (1711), *Homer's Iliad* (1712).

hand, Vanbrugh's *Confederacy*, 1705, was brought out by Jacob Tonson, the regular publisher for Congreve. Tonson was on especially intimate terms with Vanbrugh,* and was closely associated with him, as with Congreve and Walsh, in the famous Kit-Kat Club. It is almost certain that Tonson would have been the publisher of any play issued by these three writers in 1704.

Thus far we have seen that both Congreve and Ozell, the writer of the unsigned preface to *Squire Trelooby*, asserted in 1704 that the printed version of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* was not the work of the joint authors, and that James Ralph gave corroborative testimony thirty years later when he issued what he declared to be the first printing of the manuscript of Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh.

As regards Ralph it is only fair to say that he was not, like Ozell, a substantial, reliable citizen with whom translation was a cherished avocation, but a hack writer of dubious reputation who had failed in his own efforts as a playwright, and who would not have been above forging the names of three prominent writers to ensure the favourable reception of a play. Indeed, certain passages in his preface to *The Cornish Squire* give colour to the suggestion.† It would have been, of course, no difficult matter for him to alter the printed *Squire Trelooby*, or another translation of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* that had appeared in 1732,‡ and pass off the resulting play as the work of Vanbrugh and others. Whether he did or not will probably never be confidently determined, but a comparison of *The Cornish Squire* with *Squire Trelooby* suggests certain probabilities.

One play is by no means a reprint of the other; differences are to be found in punctuation, stage directions, phraseology, omissions and additions, and even in the arrangement of the scenes. *Squire Trelooby* is, on the whole, a faithful translation of Molière; *The Cornish Squire* is less faithful. The former adds or omits fifteen or twenty short speeches; the latter adds or omits over sixty, and it also

* Evidence of the strong friendship is to be found in the letters from Vanbrugh to Tonson now at Bayfordbury, Hertfordshire, in the possession of H. W. Clinton-Baker, Esq., through whose courtesy I have been enabled to examine the manuscripts. See also Nicholas Rowe, *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1714), pp. 14-16.

† In the preface to *The Cornish Squire* Ralph mentions the authorship of the play, and then adds: "What Influence these great Names may have on the Publick, I won't pretend to determine; perhaps they may, at least, excite a Curiosity to attend the first Night of its Performance, which, during the present Situation of the Theatres, may be esteem'd something of a Favour, and, if it meets with Approbation from the Judges, the rest will follow of course."

‡ *Select Comedies of M. de Molière*, London, 1732.

omits about a third of the long debate between the physicians in the first act, the passage, omitted in the acted version, that Ozell prided himself on having given in full. *Squire Trelooby* follows exactly the arrangement of scenes in the early editions of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*; *The Cornish Squire* uses one scene less for the first act, two more for the second act, and two more for the third act.*

Notwithstanding the notable differences between the two plays, in phraseology † and otherwise, there are so many parallel passages, even when the translation departs from the French source, ‡ that

* The two scenes at the end of the third act, which supply matter not found in *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, have been attributed to Ralph (Ward, *op. cit.*, I. lii.) in spite of his disclaimer in the preface. These additions, if not dating from 1704, may well have been made by Vanbrugh, or by Vanbrugh and Congreve, two years later while these dramatists were managing the Haymarket Theatre. We know that *Squire Trelooby* was revived and acted six times at the Haymarket during January and February, 1706. The advertisement of an "entirely new" third act may have been based upon the additions that appear in *The Cornish Squire*. See the advertisements in *The Daily Courant* for January 28, 29, 31 and February 1, 4, 18, 1706.

† In order to indicate something of the differences in phraseology I give below several passages for comparison. In each instance the passages are quoted from (1) *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* (the edition of Despois and Mesnard), (2) *Squire Trelooby*, (3) *The Cornish Squire*. *Squire Trelooby* frequently gives a more literal translation than *The Cornish Squire*.

From Act I, Scene ii.:

1. Ah ! comme il est bâti !
2. What a Comical cut he's of !
3. He's really an Original.

From Act I, Scene iii.:

1. Sans doute.
2. No doubt on't.
3. Indeed, I think so.

From Act I, Scene iv.:

1. Le voilà, je ne connois autre.
2. The same, I know no other—
3. The very same.

From Act II, Scene x.:

1. Comment donc ?
2. What now ?
3. What new Mischief has befallen you ?

From Act III, Scene iv.:

1. Pour rien.
2. Nothing—
3. Nay, no Harm.

‡ Examples of parallel passages not justified by the French source are given below. The arrangement is the same as in the preceding note.

From Act I, Scene iii.:

1. Je suis votre serviteur.
2. Sir, I'm your Servant— You're the Recorder then, I judge.
3. Sir, I'm your Servant— You're the Recorder then, I suppose.

From Act I, Scene iii.:

1. Ah, ah !
2. Something manly, as one may say—
3. Something manly, as one may say—

the plays must be considered in some way interdependent. The repeated similarities cannot be accounted for as mere coincidences. One possible explanation, already noted, is that Ralph derived his version from Ozell's. Another explanation, based upon the assumption that Ralph actually made use of the manuscript of the joint translators, is that Ozell had borrowed from the acted play more than he admitted, possibly that he had attended the performance at the New Theatre on March 30, 1704, and with his own completed translation in hand, had made certain changes in accordance with the words spoken by the players.* It is also possible that Vanbrugh used the printed *Squire Trelooby* in his revision of the play for the Haymarket Theatre in 1706, and that Ralph's play was based upon Vanbrugh's revision.

One circumstance tends to show that Ralph did not derive his play from Ozell. Scenes seven and eight of the second act of *The Cornish Squire* † are distinctly unlike the corresponding passages of *Squire Trelooby* and are evidently copied from the *Select Comedies* of Molière, published in 1732. In copying these scenes Ralph follows his source much more closely than other scenes of his play ordinarily follow *Squire Trelooby*. If Ralph had derived his play from Ozell's translation, he would have used it, in all probability, much as he used the two scenes from the *Select Comedies*; that is, he would have followed the source much more closely than he has done. And if he had been following Ozell, he would have had no occasion to refer to the *Select Comedies* at all, since *Squire Trelooby* is complete.

From Act I, Scene iv. :

1. Petit-Jean ?
2. What ! Little *John* by the Windmil, at the Sign of the *Globe*—
3. What ! Little *John* by the Windmil, at the Sign of the *Globe*—

From Act II, Scene iv. :

1. Si fait ; on ne peut pas l'être davantage.
2. I defy any Man to be more so.
3. I defy any Man to be more so.

From Act II, Scene v. :

1. A la bonne heure.
2. Then we know one another—
3. Then we know one another—

* In the first edition of Pope's *Dunciad*, Book I, ii. 229, 230 (Elwin and Court-hope, *The Works of Alexander Pope* (London, 1882), iv. 277), Ozell is satirised as a borrower from Congreve or other dramatists :

"Twixt Plautus, Fletcher, Congreve, and Corneille,
Can make a C—r, Jo—n, or O—ll."

Can the association of Congreve and Ozell in this couplet be the result of Ozell's borrowing from the acted version of *Squire Trelooby* ?

† Perhaps these scenes were among the defective parts of the manuscript mentioned by Ralph in his preface.

Whatever may be the exact relationship between the English versions of *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* printed in 1704 and 1734, we can be reasonably sure that John Ozell was responsible for the former; and we cannot be sure that he borrowed from the acted version much, if anything, more than the title and the names of the characters. It is doubtful whether any extant play represents the work of Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Walsh.*

* In *The Times Literary Supplement* for June 4, 1925, Mr. Dennis Arundell has tried to identify the *Squire Trelooby* acted in 1704 with *The Gordian Knot Untied* (1691), which he ascribes to Walsh. Mr. W. J. Lawrence (*Times Literary Supplement*, June 11, 1925) has pointed out one reason for rejecting Mr. Arundell's hypothesis. It might also be added that Congreve's letter to Keally (*Summers, op. cit.*, i. 76) seems to make it clear that the joint authors adapted *Squire Trelooby* directly from Molière.

EDWARD YOUNG AND BOOK ADVERTISING

BY GEORGE SHERBURN

CURIOSLY enough, a fortnight before I saw Mr. Chapman's note (*R.E.S.* IV. [1928], 330) on the dates of Young's *Night Thoughts*, I had copied the same dates from the newspapers of the years 1742-45. Consequently it is possible not only to state that the dates in the newspapers are those of Mr. Chapman's copies, but also to contribute the dates for the first three *Nights*. The first appeared on May 31, 1742 (*Daily Post*), with a second edition advertised on July 31 (*London Evening Post*); the second *Night* came out on November 30 (*London Evening Post*), and the third on December 14, 1742 (*London Evening Post*). The fact that the contemporary owner of Mr. Chapman's copies regarded such dates seriously is reassuring; for by 1742 the advertising caption of "This Day is publish'd" had lost much of its reference to first publication, and was used at the top of most advertisements, where formerly "Just publish'd" or "Lately publish'd" might have been expected.

If there is interest in these dates, there may be some interest in another phase of book advertising which seems to me to be illustrated in a neglected episode in the life of Young. In August, 1717, Edmund Curll published, in a thin octavo, *An Ode sacred to the memory of . . . the Countess of Berkley*, written by Thomas Newcomb. On the verso of the title-page was printed a letter recommending the poem, and signed by E. Young. In various newspapers Young speedily disowned the letter. For example, we may read in the *Evening Post*, August 29, 1717, the following:

Whereas Mr. Curll the Bookseller has Pub[lished] an Ode as recommended by Mr. Young. This is to give Notice, that Curll was not authorized to do so by Mr. Young, and that the Letter prefix'd to the Ode was not written by him.

Whereupon Mr. Curll, September 3, in the same paper advertises :

Just Publish'd, Price one Shilling.

An Ode, Sacred to the Memory of that truly Pious and Honourable Lady the Countess of Berkley. This Poem I receiv'd in Manuscript from Mr. Young with the following Letter, " Mr. Curll, I have perus'd the Poem of the Reverend Mr. Newcomb, which you receive with this, with much Pleasure, and I believe you will find your Advantage considerable in Printing it. Yours E. Young, Haslemere, May 26, 1717." This Letter I prefix'd to the Poem, (not without Mr. Newcomb's Privity,) Mr. Young neither Authorizing, nor forbidding the contrary ; but since in a rude and false Advertisement, incerted in this Paper last Thursday, it is said, Mr. Young did not write this Letter, I hereby give Notice that any Gentleman may see the Original, and likewise desire no farther Correspondence with Mr. Young, since he is pleas'd to deny his own Hand. E. Curll.

N.B. The abovemention'd is a true Copy of Mr. Young's Letter. Witness my Hand, R. Francklin.

I have noted no rejoinder by Young, but in the *Evening Post* of September 7, Newcomb supports Curll's account of the letter and " cannot but stand amaz'd at Mr. Young's denying it, as well as at his ungenerous Treatment of me, without giving me the least Intimation of his unkind Design. . . ."

Evidently Young was in a position that invited inquiry. One imagines that, among others, Jacob Tonson took time to look at the letter in Curll's hands and then to write Young and ask him about it. At any rate, among the Tonson papers in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 28,275) is a folio (500) which is either Young's own hand or a copy of his written explanation of this affair. It has not heretofore been identified as Young's or printed, so far as I know. It reads :

Some time in May y^e Rev^d Mr. Newcomb read to me an Ode of his on y^e L^{dy} B. & desird me to direct him to a Bookseller ; I gave him a Letter to Mr. Curl, w^{ch} I design'd sh^d go no farther than himself. When y^e Ode was Publisht I saw a Letter prefixt with my name, but Differing from y^t I sent. I, on this, to avoid the Censure of assuming y^e Prerogative of Judging for y^e Publick, an Office above me, gave notice y^t Mr. C—— was not authorizd to publish anything of mine to y^e purpose, & y^t y^e Letter prefixt was not mine.

Mr. C—— instead of asking pardon for publishing a Letter under my Name without my leave, charges me wth denying my Hand ; & two Witnesses attest y^e Truth of y^e Charge.

The Letter publisht runs thus

(Viz) Mr. C—— I have perusd y^e Poem You receive wth this wth much pleasure, & beleive You will find y^r Advantage considerable in printing it.

The Letter I sent ran thus.

(Viz) Mr. C—— I have perusd y^e Poem of y^e Rev^d Mr. N—— w^{ch} You receive with this wth much Pleasure; *He enquird of me after a Bookseller & I directed him to you*; & I beleive you will find y^r Advantage in printing it.

When one 3^d of a Letter is omitted; & y^t Omission makes a material alteration in y^e Import of y^e Whole, I conceive y^t Letter no longer y^e same it was at first; & therefore I denyd y^e Publisht Letter was mine. [Yet] Mr C—— may say this Omission is not Material; I reply y^t it [is] material, & y^t I cant conceive any reason why Mr. C—— left it out [if not] because he knew it to be so; for had y^t Omission not been made the Letter w^d have lookt (as I designd it) as a recommendation to y^e Bookseller, not to y^e World; but y^t Omission being made, it is otherwise.

If y^e Part omitted was not Material even in Mr. C——'s Opinion, I cannot Imagine why he Omitted it. He c^d not overlook it for tis in y^e middle of y^e Letter, & a 3^d part of it; 3^{ll} He has printed y^t he calls my Letter, & if he mistook once, He c^d not so often; He got Witnesses to attest y^t y^e Printed Letter was mine, who sure w^d not attest it without Reading y^e Original Letter at y^e very time, it being a Point in w^{ch} Honest men w^d be very Punctual: I conclude y^efore Mr C—— c^d not be Ignorant of this Omission; If he thought it *material*, He sh^d have continued in y^t Part. If He thought it *Immaterial*, He ought at least (when He chargd me with so foul a Crime as y^t of denying my Hand, & y^t so often and so vehemently,) to have signifid y^t there was indeed some small omission in y^e L^r printed * but such as he thought made no alteration in y^e Import of it.

P.S. As Mr. C—— omitted y^e part above noted, so I verily think He added also y^e word *Considerable* to Advantage at y^e End of y^e Letter.

Such is Young's explanation. Possibly neither he nor Curll appears to best advantage in this episode. The surprising thing is that all three men were later friendly; and this fact is what makes one incline to be suspicious. If we recall, also, the similar "quarrel" in advertisements of the *Henriade* printed by Voltaire and the publisher N. Prévost (whose connection with the celebrated Abbé Prévost some one should investigate) in the *Daily Post* and other newspapers between March and May, 1728, one will quite naturally

* Young here has deleted the words "of w^t was in y^e Original."

tend to think that, perhaps unwittingly, Young was a party to what in twentieth-century America might be called a "publicity stunt." At any rate Young eventually was not blind to the effectiveness of Curll's methods and on occasion was ready to accept Curll as his own publisher.

Professor Griffith, in the Introduction to the second section of his *Pope Bibliography* (1927), has shown how Pope used Curll to advertise editions of his *Letters*, and with the added cases of Voltaire and Young before us—and there must be many more—it seems necessary always to ask ourselves, when we find the wits of this controversial century "denying their Hands" or otherwise violently passing the lie, whether the source of all this wrath may not be a desire to gain attention rather than a love of exhibiting ill-nature. Most publishers, to be sure, contented themselves with conventional announcements such as "This day is publish'd"; Defoe's publishers (not Defoe himself, I think) wrote title-pages that were substantially "blurbs"; but the loudest advertising device—not the most dignified—was the quarrel. Remembering this we may reconcile ourselves to modern methods.

THE DIALECT OF MORTE ARTHURE

BY S. O. ANDREW

THE dialect of the alliterative *Morte Arthure* seems never to have been adequately discussed, though there are assertions about it in plenty. Neither Perry nor Brock, in the *E.E.T.S.* edition, refers to the dialect; Björkman, in the German edition, merely says that "the dialect cannot be determined—there are Northern as well as Midland forms," though in his notes he assumes that the text was originally Northern; Schofield, in his *Eng. Lit. from the Conquest to Chaucer*, says that "the poem is probably North-west Midland," without however giving any reasons; Amours, in his *Scottish Alliterative Poems*, says that the text, originally Scottish Northern, has been "transcribed into the Yorkshire Northern of three-quarters of a century later"; and the *Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit.* includes *M. A.* without discussion, among Scottish works, while admitting "a Southern colouring of the dialect, which is not however sufficient proof of his (the author's) English origin."

My aim in this article is to show that Schofield is right, and that the original text was North-West Midland.

Morte Arthure has come down to us in the unique copy in Lincoln Cathedral Library, in the hand of Robert Thornton, a Yorkshireman. Thornton was probably a native of Oswaldkirk, and if there were any reason to doubt that his dialect was Northern, all doubt is dispelled by the Northern character of his numerous other writings. Here, for instance, is an extract from a prose piece, *St. Edmund's Mirror* (p. 22, *E.E.T.S.*, 26):

His wysdom may þou see if þou take kepe how He hase gyffen to ylke a creature to be. Some he hase gyffen to be anely, withowtten mare, als unto stanes. Till other to be & to lyffe, als to grysse and trees. Till oþer to be, to lyffe, to fele, als to bestes. Till oþer to be, to lyffe, to fele, and with resone to deme, als to mane and to angells. For stanes erre, bot þay ne hafe nogte lyffe, ne feles nogte, ne demes nogte. Trees erre; þay lyffe, Bot thay fele noghte. Men are; þay lyffe, þay fele, and þay deme, and thay erre with stanes, þay lyffe with trees, þay fele with bestes,

and demys with angels. Here sall þou thynke besyly þe worthynes of manes kynde, how it overpasses ilke a creature.

Could one desire a better specimen of Northern English, or a more convincing demonstration how well Thornton could write it? Let us set beside it two short extracts (they are typical) from *M. A.* :

l. 1140. 3itt es þe warlow so wyghte, he welters hym under,
Wrothely þai wrythyn and wrystill togederz,
Welters and walowes over within thase buskes,
Tumbellez & turnez faste and terez þaire wedez,
Untenderly fro þe toppe þai tiltin togederz,
Whilom Arthure over and otherwhile undyre,
Fro þe heghe of þe hyll unto þe harde roche :

l. 3158. Thus they spryngen and sprede and sparis bot lyttill,
Spoilles dispetouslye and spillis theire vynes ;
Spendis unsparely, þat spared was lange,
Spedis them to Spolett with speris inewe.

Now these passages also, taken as a whole, are Northern, but Northern with a difference. Let any one compare them with the prose extract ; let him observe the admixture of Midland verb-inflections and the sprinkling of Midland spellings, and then try to persuade himself (with Amours) that they can possibly represent a Yorkshire variety of Northern, if, indeed, any dialect at all. Is it not clear that in *M. A.* we have to deal with a contaminated text? The problem is to explain the contamination, and with that object in view I propose to analyse a little more thoroughly the linguistic features of the poem :

i. *Sounds*.—In the first 1000 lines we have the following divergences from Northern : fro 3 (fra 5), hold 3 (hald 6), bothe 3 (bathe 5), to 1 (till usually), londes 4 (landes 16), bold 3 (bald 1), longys 1 (langys 4), thro, fo, wo 1 each (thra, etc., usually), worch 2 (wyrk 4), thoos 4 (thas 8, tha 5), icha 1 (ilke a 3) ; so and no are fairly common.

In the remainder of the poem we have the same or similar variations, and the following in addition : seche 3, wolde 3, then 1, beside the usual seke, walde, thanne, but on the other hand syche usually and swylk only once : nakyn, nokyn, nonkyns once each, ilkane, ilkon, ichon, once each, rynne and brynne usually but rennen once. We have also "till wyrche" beside "to wyrk."

ii. *Inflections*.—The only divergence of importance is the present plural inflection, in -en : of this there are 43 instances. The usual inflection is -es or -ez, of which (to give an idea of the proportion) in

the second 1000 lines of the poem there are 97 instances to 12 in -en. The inflection -e also occurs.

It will be clear at once from this analysis that contamination is not widespread; the non-Northern forms are comparatively few, and the text often runs on for 20 or 30 lines at a time in pure Northern.

Now, what the defenders of a Northern origin have to show is, how these sporadic Midland forms come to be in the text. It is no use talking vaguely, with the *C.H.E.L.*, of "the Southern colouring of the dialect," as though these forms had somehow intruded themselves into a Northern text; we know that Thornton transcribed the text into its present shape, and the question to be answered is, "How did such a skilful writer come to admit Midland forms into his Northern transcript?" The obvious reply is that they were present in his original text, and that he kept them in his own. But why did he leave them in? The answer to this question seems to lie in Thornton's date.

To take the verb inflections first; a pr. pl. -en would normally become Northern -e or -es. Now Thornton was writing about the middle of the fifteenth century, and by that time the final -e inflection had ceased to be pronounced; yet in many places he needed the syllable in order to preserve the rhythm. Often, of course, he could change -en into -es, but where the verb had a pronoun-subject (we, they, etc.) that device was not open to him (though once he does write "they bussches"); he was therefore driven to retain the -en of the original. It is, I think, significant that the majority of the -en forms in *M. A.* have a pronoun-subject, and that they occur usually in the second half-line, where the characteristic falling-rhythm, (.)'..', could not otherwise have been preserved:

1144 | þai tiltin togederz
3127 | þai stroyen for ever
1860 | and blonkes þai hewen
3618 | takell þai ryghtten

It is to be noted that where the next word begins with a vowel (e.g. 2809 þai ryden awaye), the form in -e could never have stood at any time, even when the -e was pronounced: -en is therefore original. As for the forms in -en without a pronoun-subject, where -ez would have done equally well, *hypotheses non fingo*: Thornton may well have thought "in for a penny in for a pound."

There remain the sporadic spellings so, fro, hold, etc. (i. above).

Regarding these, I can offer no suggestion, except that by 1450 they were becoming standard spellings, and an official like Thornton, accustomed to such spellings, may easily have slipped into them occasionally, especially if they were in the text he was copying.

However the case may be, it seems to me that a strong presumption has been established that the original *M. A.* was in a Midland dialect. This is confirmed by the evidence of the alliterations in the poem (there are no rhymes). We have :

- i. wh- alliterating with w-, e.g.

553 He wyлле wyghtlye in a qwhyte on his wayes hye
3231 That I ne wiste no waye whedire þat I sholde

- ii. In words like "give," the 3- form is used, as well as the g- form, e.g.

1503 Fore gyftes þat þow gyffe may þou zeme not þe selfen
2628 He made me zoman at zole and gafe me gret gyftes

Here the alliteration certifies *ziftes*, *zef*, *zaf*, instead of the g- forms which Thornton has substituted. It is strange that Björkman in his *Lautlehre* singles out the g- forms in the poem as the one positive evidence of a Northern original: the g- forms are certainly the rule, but (as in *Sir Gawain*) 3- forms are admitted if they suit.

- iii. Alternative forms like *shift skift*, *chirche kirk*, etc., are used indifferently; the first pair are equally frequent in the poem.

Now these three features in the alliteration definitely rule out a Northern origin. The last two are characteristic of all the North Midland dialects, East, Central, and West. Can we go a stage further, and assign *M. A.* to one particular tract of this North Midland belt?

I believe we can. It is a well-known fact that a transcriber, however careful, from one dialect into another is liable, through misreading or misunderstanding or sheer inadvertence, to make certain kinds of mistake. We shall not as a rule expect to find instances of gross misapprehension in a transcriber so intelligent as Thornton, but there are a fair number of small tell-tale mistakes, scattered through his text, which strike me as remarkable.

- i. l. 3064. With the erle eldeste son he sent hym the kayes.

The feminine pronoun is wanted for the sense, and editors correct he to scho, the usual form in our *M. A.* But nobody could

mistake (against the sense) scho for he, and I feel certain that Thornton had *ho* before him, here and elsewhere.

ii. He has mistaken an infinitive in *-en* for a present plural, and changed the *-en* to *-ez*,

3154 Wroghte wedowes ful wlonke wrotherayle synges

Here we have a clear misunderstanding: synges should be syngen, infinitive after wroghte. Possibly 1954 is another instance of the same kind.

iii. We have two Western preterites in *ē*, 1486 þai bere, 4147 I breke. Did not Thornton mistake them for presents?

iv. We have the readings:

1944 Thou art apparant to be ayere *are* one of thi childyre

2663 Tak hede to þis henseman þat he no horne blawe

Are þou heȝly in haste bees hewen al to peces.

In each case the coordinating conjunction *or* is wanted. How could Thornton have made the mistake, unless he had a text before him in which the forms for *or* and *are* were the same?

v. There are no instances of *mon*, *bonk*, and the like, unless downkyng (danking) be one. There is, however, curious evidence that the transcriber was correcting *o*'s to *a*'s, for he writes blank (=horse) and rane (923 In ranez and in rosers). Does he not here convict himself by excess of zeal? Rane is obviously rone (ON. runnr), and the form rane is impossible. Björkman does, indeed, attempt to justify it as =NE. rain, a ridge: a desperate defence! Roes and reindeer do not run about on this kind of ridge.

vi. There is no instance of "her" "hem" (=their, them) in the text, or of any mistake arising from them.* But there is evidence, indirect but very significant, that Thornton had the forms before him in the original. It is well known that in alliterative texts the present plural in *-en* is used by preference before words beginning with a vowel or *h*. Now of the 38 *-en* forms standing before another word in *M. A.*, 26 are before words beginning with a consonant, a remarkably high proportion. The proportion in *Sir Gawain* is 22 before vowels: 14 before consonants. If, however, we change their and them in *M. A.* to her and hem, e.g. in 742 faken theire cobles, the corresponding ratio for that poem becomes 24:14, almost the same as in *Sir G.*

* I may perhaps point out that if the original was a W.M. text, the forms would be *hor*, *hom*, not *her*, *hem*, and a transcriber would not be so likely to go wrong with them.

The mistakes just dealt with point unmistakably to an original West Midland text; they are indeed complete in their range, and are precisely the mistakes which one would say *a priori* that a transcriber from WM. into N. would fall into. I do not think I am pressing them unfairly: taken separately they are very small points, but taken in conjunction they seem to me to be strong cumulative evidence, all pointing one way, that the original *M. A.* was in a North-Western dialect.

The argument of this article may now be summarised as follows:

1. The original *M. A.* had present plurals in -en, and infinitives in -en, rimed *wh* with *w*, used indifferently *g*-forms and *3*-forms, and had *or*=are (ere).

It was therefore not Northern but Midland.

2. The original *M. A.* had second and third present sing. verb-forms in -es (there is not a trace of either -st or -th), and it had *skift*, *kirk*, etc., beside *shift*, *chirche*, etc.

It was therefore not Central or South Midland.

3. The original *M. A.* had *ho*=she, and (possibly) *hor*=their; it had the preterites *bere*, *breke* (one of them in the singular), and (probably) *mon*, etc., instead of *man*, etc.

It was therefore West Midland.

We reach, by a process of elimination, the conclusion, irresistible as it seems to me, that *M. A.* was written in a North-West Midland dialect.*

P.S.—There is a curious tell-tale mistake in Thornton's version of *St. Edmund's Mirror*. On p. 23, l. 10 (*E.E.T.S.*, No. 26) we have "with gud ryghte pay love þe, and Onoures þe, and gloryfyes þe . . .," and afterwards, "þay love þe for þaire gudnes, þay anouren þe for þaire fairenes, etc." It is clear from the context that "anouren" is the same word as "Onoures," and in T.'s dialect should be "þay anoure" (or "onoure"). T. obviously intended the word to be *anourn* (OF. *aourner*), which is sometimes confused in late ME. with *onoure*. But he would never have thought of *anourn* if he had not had before him in the original (þai) *onouren*, a Midland pr. plural. Here is a bit of internal evidence for those who hold that *St. Edmund's Mirror* was a S. Midland work.

* Since writing the above, I find that the weighty authority of the late Dr. Henry Bradley is on the same side; see *Collected Papers*, p. 225, where however the point is not argued.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

A POLITICAL REFLECTION IN PHILLIP'S *PATIENT GRISSELL*

JOHN PHILLIP'S *Commodye of pacient and meeke Grissill* appears to have been entered twice on the Stationers' Register, first in the year beginning July 1565 and again in the year beginning July 1568.* On the basis of a reference to the "wethercock of Paules," destroyed in 1561, Sir Edmund Chambers suggests that it probably dates before that time.† The closing prayer for Elizabeth indicates that it cannot date long before 1561. Indeed, it seems likely that the play dates from the early 'sixties, and is therefore roughly contemporary with *Gorbuduc*. The play contains a suggestion of political import similar to that in *Gorbuduc*: the danger to the state through the lack of an assured succession.

Although the source of the play is ultimately Boccaccio, it resembles Chaucer's version more closely. When the play opens, the nobles are attempting to persuade the Marquis to marry in order that he may have an heir. The same theme occurs in the source, but in the play it is emphasised by allusions to the unrest among the commons because the succession is not assured. The Marquis Gautier, realising that his subjects are unhappy, demands the reason: ‡

Gautier. Say what you please we doo you frely lycence,
I can not graunt before I heare your sentence.

Fidence. Lōg time haue your seruāts hard, y^e cōmōs mutrīg voice
Long time haue we cōceald the cause, why they can not reioice
Long time haue we in secret close, gusht forth our bitter teares
Long haue we spēt in dolful plaints, these fragrāt fertil yeares
The cause unknown to you we Judge, of this our mestful chear
Which to redresse prepare wth speed, to heare thy listning eare.

* *The Play of Patient Grissell*, by John Phillip. Edited by R. B. McKerrow and W. W. Greg, Malone Society Reprints (London, 1909), Introduction, p. v.

† *The Elizabethan Stage*, iii, p. 466.

‡ Sig. B, ii verso ff.

Gautier listens to a plea that he marry to ensure an heir. Sobrietic explains :

This is the meane why we remaine in pensive pained plight,
This is the cause that anguishes doth, our sollace banishes quit,
That you in single state abyde, and marriage do refraine
Would god you would inioye that yoaake, the swaged were our paine
The should our mestfull harts that long, haue subiect bine to woe
Cast of the clogge of heauines and drye teares forgoe,
Then shold our tristfull mindes exile, their dolfull deadly care,
And ioy, infrig those grisly gulphes, which doth our footsteps snare.

A bit further on, Fidence retorts to Gautier's defence of single life, which he supports with the authority of St. Paul :

We graunt that scripture doth extoull, *vestais* sauorie flower
And happy are the continent, which rest within hir bower,
But yet for you more mete it were, conioyned for to be,
That after you your sead of rule, might haue the dignite,
For wher ther is no ishue left the wise man saith plaine,
That euery man in Lordlie state, doth couit for to raigne.

Gautier consents to wed, provided he is given freedom of choice : *

Gautier. Content your myndes if case I graunt, your state for to redresse :
Ye shall permit your worthie Lord, in choyce to vse his skill,
And eke permit as reason is, to marye whom I will.

Sobrietic. Chuse wher you please, take whō ye list, we wil you not gainsay.

Gautier then chooses a maid from his realm ; his chief thought is the pleasure which he is affording his subjects : †

My subieckes now whose long desier, doth wish my Mariage daie
Shall haue the thinge that they expeckt, with out longer delaye,
Wherefore my knights your selues bedeck, in sumptuous araye,
To solemnise with out all let, this longe desyred daye.

Such references to the desirability of assuring an heir to succeed the ruler could not fail to strike the audience with their topical significance in the early years of Elizabeth's reign when the Queen's marriage was already a burning issue. *Gorbuduc* makes use of an

* Elizabeth's anxiety to keep the marriage question in her own hands is well known. In the *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, 1558-1580, p. 19, is a letter from Il Schifanoia to King Philip, dated at London, January 23, 1559, in which he says : "Some persons declare that she (the Queen) will take the Earl of Arundel, he being the chief peer of this realm, notwithstanding his being old in comparison with the Queen. . . . Other persons assert that she will take a very handsome youth, 18 or 20 years of age, robust, &c., judging from passion, and because at dances and other public places she prefers him more than any one else. . . . A third opinion is, that she will marry an individual who till now has been in France on account of his religion, though he has not yet made his appearance, it being known how much she loved and loves him." Cf. also the statement made by the writer of the enclosure in Paulo Tiepolo's letter [to be cited later] that "Some persons are of opinion that she will marry to please herself."

† Sig. C, iii.

old legend for an extended allegory on the succession. It was produced by inns-of-court men before the Queen with the hope that it would drive home a useful lesson. *Patient Grissell* is no allegory. It simply uses an incident in an old story in such a fashion that it had contemporary political meaning. There is nothing to indicate the occasion or place of the play's production. But whether it had been acted at a university, the inns of court, or a tavern, the reference to the Marquis' marriage would have been recognised as equivalent to allusion to the contemporary political situation.

From the controversial drama of Elizabeth's predecessors had come a tendency to meddle on the stage in religion and politics. A letter dated February 6, 1559, from Il Schifanoia to Ottaviano Vivaldino, Mantuan ambassador with King Philip at Brussels, states : *

There are yet many frivolous foolish people who daily invent plays in taverns in derision of the religion, and, by placards posted at the corners of the streets, they invite people to the taverns, to see these representations, taking money from their audience.

Although an order was passed forbidding such plays, it does not seem to have been very effective. In the same letter, the writer says of the rumours about the Queen's marriage :

About the marriage, it is still said by the vulgar that one Master Pickering (Sir William Pickering) will be her husband. He is an English Knight, who was sent to Germany, and for the last three months he has been ill at Dunkirk. Should he recover, I hear that he has something good in hand.

It is further worth noticing that in the play, the Marquis pleases his subjects by taking a mate of low birth from among his own subjects. Only Politicke Persuasion, the vice, whose name is significant, is displeased and engenders strife because of Grissell's inferior origin. He tells the courtiers that

In her ther is no iot of noble sanguinnite
Therfore vnfitly that her seed should rule or haue dignitie.†

The commoners particularly were pressing Elizabeth to marry a native Englishman.‡ In 1559 and for the next year or two gossip

* *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1558-1580, p. 27.*

† Sig. E, i verso.

‡ The interest of the commons in State affairs is reflected in several passages in the *Play of Patient Grissell*. Diligence announces the joy with which the news

mentioned both the Earl of Arundel and Sir William Pickering as the possible husbands of the Queen. The latter, whom Hume describes as an unpleasant swashbuckler,* was not of high birth but made an appeal to the popular imagination. Betting in London was 25 to 100 on Pickering as the future husband of the Queen in the spring of 1559.† In a letter from London enclosed in a communication from Paulo Tiepolo, dated February 17, 1559, occurs an account of the pressure being brought by the people on the Queen to marry: ‡

Parliament also sent a deputation to pray the Queen that she will be pleased to marry within the Realm, something having been heard to the contrary, but they did not propose to her a patrician rather than a plebeian; and her Majesty, after having first made some verbal resistance to the first point, as becoming a maiden, replied that to oblige them she would marry; adding with regard to the second point, that she had well seen how many inconveniences her sister was subjected to, from having married a foreigner. Some persons are of opinion that she will marry to please herself (as it seemed to me that I also should do the like), and perhaps a person of not much lineage. Amongst those most frequently mentioned is a gentleman who is now in Flanders, and who is said to be ill there. Guess who he is!

of the birth of a male heir is received (Sig. F, iii). The Marquis' household is joyful,

"And so is the hole cuntrie I may say to you
All tristfull sorow from them is exild."

Sobrietie alludes to the pleasure of the populace in the return of Grissel to favor (Sig. H, iii verso), for

"Truly these tydynges, the commons will solace."

* Martin A. S. Hume, *The Courtships of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1896), pp. 33 ff.

† *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, 1558-1567*, p. 57; letter of Count de Feria to the King of Spain, dated May 10, 1559.

‡ Numerous references to the marriage negotiations and the interest of the people in the outcome of course occur in the *State Papers*. Michiel Surian and Paulo Tiepolo reported to the Doge and Senate in January, 1559 (*C.S.P. Ven.*, 1558-1580, p. 8):

"Parliament is to meet in the course of this month, when God grant that some vote of evil be not passed in this matter; for the Queen shows herself very greatly inclined to humour the people in everything, and to keep on good terms with them; so not only does she permit what is narrated above, but for their gratification announces her intention of marrying the Earl of Arundel, who is a native Englishman."

In the year 1567—the year before the second licensing of the *Play of Patient Grissell* for print—the people were still clamouring for the Queen to marry. Giovanni Correr, Venetian ambassador in France, wrote to the Signory from Paris on January 25, 1567:

"There is news from England that the people were urging the Queen to marry, and it is suspected here that the Queen, to oblige her people and take the burden off her shoulders, might conclude the marriage treaty with the Archduke Charles. . . ." (*C.S.P. Ven.*, 1558-1580, p. 387).

The reference is to Pickering.* The Marquis' choice of a maid from his own people in the *Play of Patient Grissell* would have aroused enthusiastic sympathy in an English audience eagerly hoping that Elizabeth would make a similar choice of a mate.

Dr. W. W. Greg has offered evidence † that the John Phillip who was the author of *Patient Grissell* is the same as the John Philip or Phillips who wrote witch tracts, pamphlets, and pious ballads. This Phillip was a Cambridge man, though the dates of his residence are somewhat in doubt. One production, perhaps typical of his quality, is entitled

A Friendly Larum, or faythfull warnunge to the true harted Subiectes of England. Discovering the Actes, and malicious myndes of those obstinate and rebellious Papists that hope (as they terme it) to haue theyr Golden day. By I. Phil. Imprinted at London in Fleetstreete, by William How: for Rycharde Iohnes.

The work probably dates from 1569-70. Evidently John Phillip was politically minded.‡

As I have previously indicated, I do not wish to pretend that Phillip was allegorising the story of Patient Grissell in any extended fashion for political purpose. I am not sure that he had any definite propagandic aim. But he did realise the political timeliness of the theme suggested in his source of the importance of an assured heir to the throne. That part he intensified and cast in contemporary terms so that the political allusions were certain of recognition. When the same material was reworked at the end of the century by Dekker, Chettle, and Haughton, after the marriage issue was long dead, only a bare mention was made of the political necessity of the Marquis' marriage.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

University of North Carolina.

* *C.S.P. Ven.*, 1558-1580, p. 28.

† "John Phillip—Notes for a Bibliography," *The Library*, 3rd series, i (1910), pp. 302-328, 396-423.

‡ Cambridge students seem to have shown considerable political activity in the 'sixties. One group were so eager to present a political play or show before the Queen that they followed her to Hinchinbrook and there gave an unofficial performance on August 10, 1564, which greatly angered Her Majesty. [Mary Susan Steele, *Plays and Masques at Court* (New Haven, 1926), p. 22.]

MACBETH AND THE "SHORT" PLAYS

PROFESSOR A. W. POLLARD, in his Shakespeare lecture to the British Academy in 1923 on *The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text*, in considering the four short plays, makes the suggestion (p. 12) that "though the occasions are doubtful, it seems certain that (despite intermediate lengths) short plays and long plays were theatrically distinct, and that while some short plays (*A Midsummer Night's Dream* I hope may be accounted one) were definitely planned as short, plays originally written as long were sometimes cut down to shortness, and plays originally written as short were occasionally expanded." The purpose of this note is to consider the nature of the Folio text of *Macbeth* in the light of this suggestion.

There is no doubt that the text of *Macbeth* in the Folio is derived from a prompt-copy. It was long ago pointed out that in the passage at II. iii. 83-85

... *Malcolme, Banquo*,
As from your Graues rise vp, and walke like Sprights,
To countenance this horror. Ring the Bell.
Bell rings. Enter Lady.

the words *Ring the Bell*, although they have crept into the text, represent an annotation by the prompter. A similar duplication of stage-directions due to a marginal note of the prompter occurs in one of the suspected witch passages (III. v. 32-35):

And you all know, Security
Is Mortals chiefest Enemie.
Musicke, and a Song.
Hearke, I am call'd: my little Spirit see
Sits in a Foggy cloud, and staies for me.
Song within. Come away, come away, &c.

The Folio stage directions for the knocking at the gate at the end of II. ii. and for the apparitions in IV. i. also afford convincing proof that both these scenes contain marginal notes by the prompter.

Any one who has examined the elaborately annotated manuscript of Massinger's *Beleue as You List* in the British Museum (Egerton 2828) will remember that at the end there is a list of letters and papers which had to be brought on to the stage during the course of the play, and that in two places the prompter, one of whose chief cares was with the properties, has made a note of them where they were to

be brought on. At the beginning of III. i. where Massinger has written *Enter Flaminius*, the prompter has added *wth 2 letters*, and at the beginning of v. i. Massinger has *Ent : Marcellus (proconsul of Scicilie)*, and the prompter has inserted *wth a letter* above the line after *Marcellus*. Bearing these examples in mind, one can perhaps attribute to the prompter, who may have been the actual man who made the additions to *Beleuee as You List*,* the numerous directions in *Macbeth* for torches and tapers: viz. *Hoboyes, and Torches. Enter King*, etc. at I. vi.; *Ho-boyes. Torches. Enter a Sewer*, etc. at I. vii.; *Enter Banquo, and Fleance, with a Torch before him* † at II. i.; *Enter Macbeth, and a Seruant with a Torch* at II. i. 9; *Enter Banquo and Fleans, with a Torch* at III. iii. 14; *Enter Lady with a Taper* at v. i. 21. With one exception, these are, of course, all night scenes where one might expect torches to be brought on to add to the illusion, but the exception is a significant one. That torches were required for the one scene in the play (I. vi.) where the spectator seems to breathe in a healthy, out-door, sun-lit atmosphere needs explanation, and the only explanation for this, as well as for the other careful notings of the times at which torches were required, is that the stage directions are for an indoor performance (at the Blackfriars Theatre) or for a night performance at the Court, for it is only at the Court that night performances are recorded at this period. That *Macbeth* was performed at the Globe we know from Dr. Simon Forman's diary, but it is difficult to believe that torches would have been used there in the scene in which Duncan approaches Macbeth's castle.

Reverting to the other "short" plays, we recollect that it is definitely known that *The Comedy of Errors* was performed at Gray's Inn during the Christmas season of 1594, and that *The Tempest* was performed during the marriage festivities of the Princess Elizabeth in 1611. The editors of the *New Cambridge Shakespeare* in their edition of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* have suggested (pp. 99-100) that that play was given in 1598 at the Earl of Southampton's wedding as well as at the wedding of the Earl of Derby in 1595.

* See the article, "Prompt Copies, Private Transcripts, and the Playhouse Scrivener," by W. W. Greg in *The Library* (1925), p. 148.

† Did this direction at an earlier stage read *Enter Banquo, with a Torch before him*, and has the prompter added the words *and Fleance* above the line? It does not much matter who accompanies Banquo here, and it is noteworthy that it is only in the speech headings immediately following this direction, and in one other place in the play (III. i. 36), that the spelling *Fleance* occurs, *Fleans* being always used elsewhere.

If then, as this note has tried to show, there is evidence in *Macbeth*, besides the compliments to James I, pointing to a Court performance of that play, Professor Pollard's contention for a class of short plays, given at private performances and "theatrically distinct" from the longer plays, becomes strengthened.

R. C. BALD.

A SONG OF D'URFEY'S WRONGLY ASCRIBED TO SHADWELL

THE song beginning "Bright was the morning cool the Air," transcribed by me from a British Museum MS. and printed in this *Review* three years ago, reappears in the Rev. Montague Summers' recent edition of Shadwell's *Works*, where the ascription to Shadwell is not questioned.* I have lately discovered the same song in Thomas D'Urfey's *A New Collection of Songs and Poems*, 8vo, 1683, where it is to be found on p. 5 under the title "*A Song on Dorinda going in a Barge up the Thames.*" The text agrees in the main with MS. Addl. 19,759, f. 20, apart from differences in spelling and punctuation, but follows MS. 30,303, f. 5 in reading "how distress'd" for "how I am opprest" in the last stanza. New variants are "dear" for "fair" in stanza i, line 3, and "did Odours" for "it's oder" in stanza ii, line 1. More important is the addition of another stanza, numbered 3, as follows:

So when the fair *Egyptian* Queen
Her Heroe went to see,
Cidnus swell'd o're his Banks in pride
As much in love as he:
Cidnus swell'd, &c.

The same poem is included in *Wit and Mirth: Or Pills to Purge Melancholy*, ed. 1719, vol. i, pp. 260-261, where the musical setting is also given. Although no composer's name is mentioned there is no reason to doubt that Shadwell set the music. That he was on friendly terms with D'Urfey may be inferred from the fact that the latter wrote the panegyrical Prologue to *The Volunteers*, Shadwell's posthumously produced play.

D. M. W.

* See *R.E.S.*, i, 350-352. Mr. Summers reprints both songs in his edition, vol. v, pp. 383, 384, and provides a facsimile of the MS. His textual notes on p. 410 follow those in *R.E.S.*, without reference.

COLERIDGEANA

STUDENTS interested in the remarkable collection of Coleridge marginalia in the British Museum owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Henry Nidecker for his publication in the *Revue de Littérature Comparée** of many of the most important notes. Dr. Nidecker's selection of material—the notes on Kant, Schelling, and several of the German Natur-Philosophen—is significant, and his editorial comments throw light on important facts connected with Coleridge's philosophical work and suggest further research that should be conducted. As I had been obliged to make my own first-hand study of the marginalia before the publication of Dr. Nidecker's work, I have a few points to add to the first section of that work, the notes on Kant, begun in the first and completed in the third number of the *Revue* for 1927

I. COLERIDGE'S USE OF KANT'S *Logic*

Dr. Nidecker presents (pp. 135 and 140) conclusive evidence that Kant's *Logic* was in Coleridge's hands † while he was dictating to Watson and Stutfield, c. 1822, and adds :

On n'a pas encore tiré suffisamment au clair la question de savoir ce qui subsiste des dictées commencées en 1822 : les "Monologues," en tout cas, me semblent en avoir fait partie (cf. *Fraser's Magazine*, t. XII, 1835, pp. 439 et suiv., 619 et suiv.). . . .

It will be found that the two manuscript volumes of Coleridge's *Logic* (B.M. MSS. Eg. 2825, 2826) ‡ go far toward answering the question as to the dictations, and afford indispensable material

* Vol. vii, commencing January-March issue, 1927.

† One misstatement in Dr. Nidecker's introductory paragraphs may cause difficulties unless it is corrected. He writes (p. 131) : " Parmi les œuvres de Kant, la *Logique* parut en traduction anglaise : Coleridge mit des notes en marge de son exemplaire de cette traduction. Mais comme l'ouvrage est rare aujourd'hui, je me crois justifié de donner mes indications d'après l'original allemand, et c'est même cet opuscule qui se trouvera en tête de ma liste." There must be some confusion here, probably with an English translation of the *Introduction to the Logic* (T. K. Abbott, 1885) in which some of Coleridge's manuscript notes were printed. The copy that contains the annotations in Coleridge's autograph, however, is the British Museum copy of the German edition of 1800.

‡ This uncompleted work is the MS. referred to by J. D. Campbell (*Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, 1894, p. 251 note) and E. H. Coleridge (*Letters*, 1895, p. 753 note). It was written out by two different amanuenses or copyists. I am at present engaged in preparing for publication an annotated synopsis and index, together with the full text of passages left in such shape as to justify printing.

for the study of Coleridge's relations to Kant. In his chapter "On the Logical Acts" (Eg. 2826, ff. 18-116), Coleridge uses material taken from Kant's *Logic* and gives the substance of one of his own MS. annotations to the volume.*

Dr. Nidecker notes (p. 138) that he has been unable to find in Kant's *Logic* and in Lambert's letters to Kant the exact passages that Coleridge refers to in the marginal notes on ideas and abstractions. For the passage in the *Logic* I suggest that containing the following sentences (p. 148) marked in pencil, probably by Coleridge himself :

Inhalt und Umfang eines Begriffes stehen gegen einander in umgekehrtem Verhältnisse. Je mehr nehmlich ein Begriff *unter* sich enthält, desto weniger enthält er in sich und umgekehrt.

and for the passage in a letter from Lambert :

Denn General und Species enthalten die fundamenta divisionum und sub-divisionum in sich, und sind eben dadurch desto zusammengesetzter je abstracter sie sind. Der Begriff *ens* ist unter allen der zusammengesetzte (Lambert an Kant, February 3, 1766, in Kant's *Vermischte Schriften*, 1799, vol. i, p. 348).

2. REGARDING THE *Theory of Life*

The problem of dating Coleridge's posthumous *Theory of Life* is not an easy one, but Dr. Nidecker suggests 1823 as the approximate date. Commenting on the diagram that Coleridge drew on the inside of the cover of Kant's *Logic*, he states :

Ces schémas supposent la connaissance de Schelling : ils se rapportent au cycle d'idées de la *Theory of Life*, dont la date de rédaction, s'il est permis de parler ainsi, est des alentours de 1823 (p. 135).†

The poet's grandson, E. H. Coleridge, has left evidence, however, that points toward a different conclusion. A manuscript note of his, dated June 27, 1890, shown me by the Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge of Leatherhead, states that the watermark of the MS. is 1815, and that the date of composition was probably the autumn of 1816. This

* The following (Eg. 2826, f. 28) should be compared with the notes on Ideas and Abstractions printed by Dr. Nidecker (p. 138-9) : "An Idea says Kant contains in it all its subordinates. An Abstraction has all its subordinates under it but so that each subordinate contains more than its superordinate and the first Abstraction contains the least of all. . . ."

† For Dr. Nidecker's fuller discussion of this point see his *Preliminarien zur neuausgabe der abhandlung über die lebenstheorie (Theory of Life) von Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Bericht der philologisch-historischen Fakultät der Universität Basel, 5. Heft, 1927).

conclusion he derived from internal evidence (the references to Lawrence's lectures) and from an allusion in a letter from Coleridge to Gillman, November, 1816.* This evidence is by no means conclusive, but is worth considering.

Dr. Nidecker states (p. 140) that the Watson mentioned in one of the notes written in Kant's *Logic* ("After I have ceased dictating, I would be left with Watson and St.") was the Watson who later edited the *Theory of Life*. On this traditional confusion of Seth Watson, the editor of the *Theory of Life*, with the Watson (probably John) who was Coleridge's personal friend and amanuensis, I would refer to a letter of mine in the *Times Literary Supplement* for August 25, 1927.

ALICE D. SNYDER.

TWO REMARKS ON THE TEXT OF MILTON'S *AREOPAGITICA*

I

THE edition of Milton's *Areopagitica* which is most widely used by students of Milton is probably Prof. Hales's, first published by the Clarendon Press in 1874 and often reissued since. Having the opportunity of collating Hales's text with a copy of the 1644 edition in the University Library at Lausanne, I noticed a few minor discrepancies between the two texts. Taken together, these discrepancies seemed to point to an issue of the 1644 edition distinct from, less correct and consequently earlier than, that represented by the Lausanne copy. As, in the absence of any thoroughly reliable edition of Milton's Prose Works, it seemed worth while clearing up the point, I have carefully collated the three copies at the British Museum Library (C. 55. c. 22 †—713. f. 11—G. 608), as well as the three copies at the Bodleian Library (C. 14. 5. Linc.—Wood B. 29—E.H. 4. F. 56), with one another and with the Lausanne copy (T. 999). The seven copies were found to be identical in all respects.‡

* The letter is apparently still unpublished; it refers, according to E. H. Coleridge, to the dictating of an essay "on Polarity," etc.

† This is Thomason's copy, inscribed on the title-page *ex dono Authoris* and reproduced in facsimile as one of the *Norman Douglas Replicas*, 1927.

‡ The hyphen in *off-spring* on p. 9 comes out distinctly in one only of the seven copies which I have examined, namely, Bodl. C. 14. 5. Linc.

There remained to explain how the differences between the 1644 text and Hales's had arisen.

At the beginning of Section V of his Introduction (p. xliii of the 1904 reprint), Prof. Hales says :

The text of the present edition is that of the original edition of 1644. . . . It was printed in the first instance from Arber's Reprint, and then collated with the 1644 edition, of which Mr. Arber's reprint was found to be an extremely faithful reproduction, the corrections that had to be made being very few and very slight.

For the rest, I have to express great obligations to Holt White's edition of 1819. . . . His "Prefatory Remarks, Copious Notes, and Excursive Illustrations," are a very storehouse of information. . . .

It is a pity that Prof. Hales did not rely on Holt White's edition for his text as well as for so much in his commentary. For, on examination, it was found that in nearly all places where his text is corrupt, Arber's is corrupt too, whilst Holt White's gives the right reading.* There was no doubt, therefore, that the wrong readings in Prof. Hales's text had arisen from too faithful an adherence to Arber's Reprint, and that his collation of that Reprint with the 1644 edition had not been so careful as he was pleased to say.

Leaving out of account the punctuation, the use of capital letters and that of & for *and*, on p. 436 is a full list of the readings in the 1644 edition which were corrupted by Arber and should be corrected in Prof. Hales's text. Notice that in several cases Prof. Hales's text is more corrupt than Arber's.

Of the more recent editions, Cotterill's (Macmillan, 1904), Crook's (Ralph Holland & Co., 1904), Lockwood's (Harrap, 1912), all modernise the spelling. But in most cases where the difference between the right and the wrong reading is not merely a matter of spelling, they reproduce the wrong one. Thus Cotterill's gives : *by the disexercising,† most of the, show, if we so jealous, unite in one, the weak and misled, they may serve*. But he gives the right reading in one case : *God send*. Crook's has the right reading in four of these cases : *by disexercising, should, God send, they may yet serve*. Lockwood's has it in three : *should, if we be so, the weak and the misled*. Otherwise they follow Prof. Hales's.

* In three cases only, Holt White's text differs from the 1644 text. One of these differences is the correction of an obvious misprint. See table for two of these cases and II for the third.

† This is also the reading I find in *N.E.D.*, where the only instance of the word it gives is this one.

MacAllen's edition (Normal Press, *n.d.*, ? 1904), in which the spelling has not been modernised, merely reproduces Prof. Hales's text with all its corruptions.

Holt White's 1819 as in 1644 edition	Arber's 1868	Hales's 1874
page 3 statelines	page 33 as in 1644 ed. but cut into two by passing from one line to the next; state-/lines	page line 3, 31 state-lines
4 by disexercising	34 by the disexercising	5, 18 as in Arber's
6 most the	37 most of the	8, 11 "
8 Emperors	38 Emperours	9, 24 "
8 dialogue-wise	40 as in 1644 ed., but : dialogue-wise	11, 29 dialoguewise
9 intellectuall	41 intellectual	12, 30 as in Arber's
12 Collegues	42 Colleagues	13, 3 "
12 should	44 show	17, 12 *
13 Talmudist	46 Talmudest	19, 16 "
20 aud	55 and	20, 14 "
21 wherein	56 wherein	30, 27 "
23 for if we be so . . .	59 for if we so . . .	34, 17 "
26 peoples	62 despis'd	38, 3 "
26 gladlier	63 gladlier	39, 4 "
27 religious	64 religious	40, 19 framework
27 frame-work	64 as in 1644 ed., but : frame-/work	32 disjoyning
28 dis-joyning	as in 1644 ed., but : dis-/joyning	41, 20 fend †
send	65 as in 1644 ed. †	24 as in Arber's
our selves	ourselves	42, 6 inability
unability	inability	8 as in Arber's
toward	towards	33 "
29 mortall	66 mortalle	43, 19 "
32 lovelines	67 loveliness	46, 20 "
32 unite into one	69 unite in one	50, 25 "
34 stick	73 stick	54, 6 rather than all
37 rather then all	76 as in 1644 ed.	56, 9 as in Arber's
38 and the misled	and misled	11 "
38 they may yet serve	they may serve	18 "
39 forejudge	77 fore-judge	

In 1918, the Cambridge University Press published Jebb's Commentary of the *Areopagitica* with a text which, though the

* The right reading being *should*, Prof. Hales's remark on *show* is superfluous.

† Arber, in his Reprint, uses *s* only finally, † otherwise.

‡ The right reading being *send*, Prof. Hales's note on *fend* is superfluous.

spelling of it has been modernised, does not reproduce the errors of Arber, Hales, and more recent editors.

To sum up : of the *Areopagitica*, there was, so far as I have been able to ascertain, only one issue in 1644. The text of this was, on the whole, faithfully given by Holt White in 1819, whilst in about thirty places it was more or less corrupted by Arber in 1868. Prof. Hales, in his deservedly well-known edition, merely reproduced Arber's text, further corrupting it in a few particulars. More recent editors have generally preserved Prof. Hales's errors. Only the Pitt Press edition of 1918 gives, apart from spelling and punctuation, a reliable text.

II

In two places in Thomason's copy of the 1644 *Areopagitica*, the text has been corrected in a contemporary hand, namely in p. 12, where *the true wayfaring Christian* has been corrected into *the true warfaring Christian*, and in p. 34 where *Beleeve it, Lord and Commons* has been corrected into *Beleeve it, Lords and Commons*.

There is no doubt, of course, that the latter correction is the correction of a mere misprint. That the former is also the correction of a mere misprint has not been universally admitted. It would, I submit, be accepted as such if reasons could be given to believe the correction to be in Milton's own hand. Prof. Hales, in his note on the passage, says that "the 'y' is crossed out and 'r' written above, *credibly by the author himself*." This is credible, not only because the *r* is like the usual *r* of Milton's own hand, and the correction is an undoubted improvement, but also because it occurs in a copy presented to one of his friends by the author himself.

Now it happens that Thomason's copy in the British Museum Library is not the only copy of the *Areopagitica* to contain these two MS. corrections. They are also to be found in two of the Bodleian copies, namely, Wood B. 29 and E.H. 4. F. 56, as well as in the Lausanne copy referred to above. In the four copies, the corrections are by the same hand and they are made in exactly the same way : the *y* being crossed through with two strokes sloping from left to right* and *r* written above for the first correction, and in the case of "Lord" the correction being : Lord^s.

* In Bodl. E.H. 4. F. 56, however, the *y* is crossed through a little differently, though still with two strokes.

Thomason's copy was presented to him by the author himself. There are reasons to believe that the three other copies with the two corrections were also presentation-copies.

E.H. 4. F. 56 of the Bodleian Library is the bound collection of his early pamphlets, arranged in chronological order, which Milton presented to John Rous, Librarian of the Bodleian from 1620 to 1652 (see D. Masson, *Life of Milton*, iii. p. 646).*

Wood B. 29 is also a collection of eight of Milton's pamphlets in one volume, the binding of which seems to be of the middle of the seventeenth century. On the fly-leaf are written the names of *Edward Rigby* (three times), *Alice Rigby* (three times) and *Lucy Hesketh* (once), all apparently in the same hand. I find no reference to Alice Rigby or Lucy Hesketh in either J. Hunter's *Familiae Minorum Gentium* or *D.N.B.* There is, however, an *Edward Rigby* mentioned in *D.N.B.* as the third son of Alexander Rigby, the parliamentary colonel (1594-1650). This Edward Rigby must have been much younger than Milton, since his father only married in 1619, but there is no impossibility that his copy of the *Areopagitica* came to him from some member of his family who had received it from Milton himself.

The Lausanne copy was bequeathed to our library by Loys de Bochat (1695-1754), a professor at the *Académie*, whose family were burghers of Vevey. It had been at one time in the possession of a Polier. Though it is impossible to know how a volume containing Milton's Divorce Tracts and his *Areopagitica* came to the Pays de Vaud, the most likely explanation is that it was taken there by one of the "regicides," Ludlow, Broughton, Phelps or Lisle, who had come to live at Vevey after the Restoration. That Milton himself presented one of them with a corrected copy of his *Areopagitica* seems a plausible conjecture.

Those considerations may help to confirm the position of those who believe that the correction of *wayfaring* into *warfaring* is due to Milton himself.

G. A. BONNARD.

Lausanne.

* It would be of some interest to ascertain whether the copy of the *Areopagitica* in a similar collection of pamphlets presented by Milton to Patrick Young (*Patricius Junius*) and now in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, also contains the two MS. corrections. See Masson, *Life of Milton*, iii, 645.

CHAUCER'S "IN TERMES"

PROFESSOR REED, in *R.E.S.*, vol. 4 (April 1928), p. 220 (foot), has this note on Chaucer's *Prologue*, l. 323 :

Prof. Manly, I note, appears to misread the line—

In termes hadde he caas and doomës alle,

which means *not* that he could quote them *but* that he had a collection of Year Books containing them, arranged in Terms, *i.e.* Hilary, Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas.

By a most extraordinary coincidence, Skeat, Pollard, Liddell, Onions, and several others, seem to have "misread" the same line in much the same way as Professor Manly. This new interpretation, in spite of its air of finality that the pyramids might envy, will not do. "Feeling" is against it; but since that is not as conclusive to others as it is to oneself, I quote, with his permission, from Mr. Onions's reply to my appeal for confirmation :

Prof. Reed's interpretation of Chaucer A. 323 assumes that there was a use of *term* in the sense of a collection of cases and decisions disposed according to the law terms as in year books. I do not find evidence of such a use; and the sense of law-term of which it would be an extension is not evidenced in *N.E.D.* before 1454.

In terms is a well-authenticated M.E. idiom (see our *TERM*, *sb.* 14 b) meaning in proper terms or language, in set terms or phrases (and hence, in so many words) : here, in set legal phrases.

The year books are, of course, headed "De termino sancti Hilarii" and so forth; but it is rash to assume that a collection of such documents with such headings would be called terms.

A. J. WYATT.

REVIEWS

The Book of the Ordre of Chyualry: Translated and printed by WILLIAM CAXTON from a French version of RAMÓN LULL's "Le Libre del Orde de Cauayleria, together with ADAM LOUTFUT's Scottish transcript. Ed. by ALFRED T. P. BYLES, M.A., Lecturer in English at the Exeter Diocesan Training College. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1926. Pp. lxviii+143. 15s. net.

INCLUDED in this very useful edition are both Caxton's translation and the Scottish transcript made by Adam Loutfut and preserved in MS. Harleian 6149.

The Introduction is a thorough and valuable piece of scholarship. The questions of the authorship of the original text and of the relationship of the various extant versions, Catalan, French, Scots and English, are very complicated, and have given rise to a number of serious misunderstandings. Mr. Byles has reduced the somewhat chaotic mass of material to very fair order. His identification of the original author with the Majorcan Ramón Lull, who was martyred by the Saracens at Bugia in 1315, is convincing, and, I should imagine, final. Much of the confusion existing in the minds of earlier critics has, as Mr. Byles points out, been caused by a mistaken identification of the French prose version with the thirteenth-century poem *L'Ordène de Chevalerie*, and with later prose versions of this. The relationship between the French printed editions of 1504 and 1505, which was misunderstood by Stevenson, is also made clear by Mr. Byles in a careful and detailed examination of their points of similarity and divergence. The claim by Symphorien Champier to the authorship of *L'Ordre* is also shown, by indisputable chronological evidence, to be without foundation.

A very full account is given of Caxton's English version and of the Scots versions of Gilbert Hay and Adam Loutfut. The fact that Hay seemed to be under the impression that Bonet, Prior of Salon

about 1382, was the author of *L'Ordre*, is at first sight disconcerting ; but Mr. Byles is probably right when he suggests that Bonet's work may frequently have been bound together with texts of *L'Ordre* (as in fact it is in Brit. Mus. MS. Add. 22768), and that this may have led Hay to believe that Bonet was the author.

Mr. Byles' classification of the MSS. and texts according to variations in subject-matter brings out some interesting points. Lull's original *Orde de Cauayleria*, he points out, is the most concise, but contains all the essential ideas which later appear in Caxton's version. The "decoration" of the text began with the French scribes, who added illustrative passages, such as that in Chapter vii. Lull's Prologue is also the shortest. Here he introduces the symbolism of the seven planets, to which the seven chapters of the discourse correspond. This symbolism, Mr. Byles notes, is discarded in the later versions, which have a division into eight chapters instead of the original seven. The later texts have two versions of this Prologue—a variation which Stevenson makes the basis for the division of the MSS. into two groups, representing two independent translations from a common original. With this conclusion Mr. Byles disagrees, holding that a sounder basis for classification is provided by the variations in the Royal MS. 14. E. ii. This argument he supports by a detailed examination of the differences between the extant French MSS. and prints. The relationship of the French versions to that of Caxton, and that of Caxton to Gilbert Hay's *Buke of Knychthede* is thus made clear. As Mr. Byles points out, Hay's version is not a translation, but a free paraphrase and expansion, affording interesting points of comparison with the other versions, especially with that of Lull.

HELEN T. McMILLAN BUCKHURST.

The Life and Works of Thomas Lupset, with a critical text of the original treatises and the letters. By JOHN ARCHER GEE. New Haven : Yale University Press. London : H. Milford. 1928. Pp. xviii + 358.

HIGH praise must be given to this very scholarly and welcome work. Thomas Lupset, though his life was cut short at the age of thirty-five, was one of the most interesting and most admirable of the pioneers of the New Learning in England. The favourite pupil

of Dean Colet, the champion of Erasmus, the assistant both of Erasmus and Linacre, the editor of the second edition of the *Utopia*, the teacher of humanism at Oxford, the friend of Richard Pace and Reginald Pole, the servant of Wolsey and tutor of his son, Lupset was in touch with every phase of the intellectual movement of his day. An ardent reformer of abuses, with an English reverence for established order where it seemed to be good, a brilliant teacher, a human-hearted man who gave himself freely to others and was loyal in his friendships, he may well have been described after his early death as "the flowre of lerned men of his tyme." Well is it that at last his life has been given to the world by a biographer so competent, so indefatigable in research, and so cautious in drawing conclusions as Dr. Gee.

The "works" that Lupset has left us are but few, three English treatises of moral and religious admonition, and a dozen Latin letters, including the three printed in the *Epistolæ aliquot eruditorum*, in which his devotion to Erasmus led him to be a little too vituperative of Erasmus' assailant, Edward Lee. The three treatises, then, on which his literary fame must rest are *A Treatise of Charitie*, printed in 1533 and 1539; *An Exhortation to Young Men*, 1535, 1538, 1544; and *A Treatise of Dieyng Well*, 1534, 1541, all being included in the *Workes*, 1546 and 1560. Of these the second is the most important.

Dr. Gee further considers that Lupset was the translator of (1) *A Sermon of Saint Chrysostome*, "in officina Thomas Bertheleti," 1542, and (2) *The sermon of doctor Colete made to the Conuocacion*, Thomas Berthelet excudebat (? 1531), and that he had a hand in (3) *Xenophons treatise of Householde . . . trans. by Gentian Heruet*, 1532, 1534, 1537, 1544 (all Berthelet), 1557 (Veale). These works are not reprinted in this collection.

The *Treatise of Charitie* (anonymous till 1546, but undoubtedly by Lupset) is assigned by Dr. Gee to the first half of 1529. It is addressed to "my entierly beloued syster," i.e. apparently "spiritual sister." The dialogue has little personal interest, but the sister's failure to follow her brother's argument—she does not understand the word "passion" except in connexion with Christ's passion—affords some touches of humour. *Of Dieyng Well* is dated "At Paris the X. day of Januarye," which Dr. Gee argues is January 15²⁹/₃₀, when Lupset was at Paris with Pole. The treatise is addressed to Pole's servant, John Walker. Whether Lupset had any premoni-

tion that his own death would not be long deferred is not clear. He died on December 27, 1530.

The third work, *An Exhortation to yonge men, perswadinge them to walke in the pathe way that leadeth to honeste and goodnes* is dated "At More, a place of my lorde cardinals, in the feaste of saynte Bartholomew [24 Aug.], 1529."

All three treatises were perhaps written without any thought of publication, but this one is especially intimate. While, as an example of the art of exposition, it marks an advance, as Dr. Gee holds, on anything previously written in English, it is charged with the personality of its author. To me it is one of the most beautiful things of the kind ever written.

It would seem that Lupset, who was himself the son of a London goldsmith, undertook in the year 1527 to give instruction to two London boys, Christopher Smith, son of Andrew Smith, a notary and friend of Erasmus, and Edmond Withypoll, the son of a great merchant and man of affairs, Paul Withypoll. Both the elder men were Lupset's close friends.

Two years later, when he was in attendance on Wolsey at the Moor, Rickmansworth, Lupset addressed his *Exhortation* to Edmond Withypoll, now perhaps a lad of fifteen or sixteen, already in his father's counting-house, ambitious to accumulate wealth, combative, critical of all old-fashioned ideas, a lover of art (the Withypolls had ties with Italy), a merry companion.*

The young priest now owns that love for the boy which he had concealed while Edmond was his pupil, and affectionately reasons with him ever to put the things of the soul before those of the body and those of the body before the goods of the world. He must not presume to think he can understand the New Testament: "Leave

* We know much of his after-career—how he slew a serving-man at Walthamstow, how he settled at Ipswich on what had been a monastic estate and built the beautiful mansion, Christ Church (now the public museum); how his high-handed ways brought him trouble in Queen Mary's time; how he reared a mighty family of eleven sons and eight daughters, including Batt and Dan, the friends of Gascoigne; how he added more and more to his vast estates, while still keeping a love of art and a merry humour (he shows both in his will), and rousing the admiration of Gabriel Harvey, who includes him in a strange category of heroes: "meet for Unico Aretino or old Mr. Wythipoll or Sir Humphrey Gylbert or any such brave old head or peradventure even the Queen of Scots." Harvey included in *Two other very Commendable Letters*, "Old Maister Wythipolls owne Translation" of Dr. Norton's Latin verses, and the effort is therefore to be found in the Oxford *Spenser*. The British Museum possesses two silver medallion portraits of "Edmund Withypoll" executed in 1548 by the famous artist "Stephen H."

devising thereon : submit yourself to the exposition of holy doctors, and ever conform your consent to agree with Christ's Church." With the Gospels he should read Chrysostom and Jerome, and later the Ethics of Aristotle and Plato's Republic (both of course in Latin) and the moral treatises of Cicero and Seneca, and " the Enchiridion that Erasmus writeth." Dr. Gee well points out how far Lupset in these recommendations has gone before his master Colet, who shrank from recommending any but Christian writers. And if Colet seemed conservative to Lupset, Lupset undoubtedly seemed conservative * to the hot-blooded son of the Renaissance whom he was trying to direct. After the general advice, Lupset gives Edmond a few special directions, " because I somewhat know your disposition." He counsels him against a hot and unforgiving temper, which will create enemies for him, against lying, and again against criticising the Church :

You presume when you take in hand to amend this or that, where your part is not to speak. And specially you be presumptuous when you dare craike that you know God's will. Leave therefore, my good Edmond, all manner of meddling.

One might go on, but this must suffice. The treatise is beautiful as a piece of English, it is astonishingly interesting as a picture of good men of two generations in an age of intellectual ferment.

Dr. Gee might perhaps have entered a little more warmly into the moral interest of this and the other treatises (we could have spared some of his formal rhetorical analyses). But we cannot thank him enough for presenting these treatises to us in the light thrown on them by his wide and minute research. He has given Lupset, I hope, a place in English history and literature which he has never held before.

[On p. 175, Dr. Gee seems to take " conversatione " to mean " conversation " in its modern sense, instead of " manner of life." After l. 4 on p. 243 the words " you may set " seem to have dropped out from the original texts.]

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

* In Starkey's *Dialogue* (written probably in 1535) Lupset is made to take the Conservative and Pole the more active attitude.

The Life and Poems of Richard Edwards. By LEICESTER BRADNER. Yale Studies in English, LXXIV. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. 144. \$2. 8s. 6d. net.

DR. LEICESTER BRADNER's study of the *Life and Poems of Richard Edwards* is an interesting sequel to its more substantial predecessor in the Yale Studies in English, Dr. Merrill's *Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*. Edwards was four years junior to Grimald, but both were elected to lectureships at Christ Church in 1546, the one in Rhetoric, the other in Logic. Grimald was the better scholar, but Edwards was an accomplished musician. Considered together they represent an important contribution made by the Universities in the reigns of Edward and Mary and the earlier years of Elizabeth to the new movements in academic verse and drama. Grimald edited *Tottel's Miscellany*, while its first successor, *The Paradise of Dayntie Devises*, appeared in 1576 with a title-page bearing the statement that it was "devised and written for the most part by M. Edwardes, sometimes of her Maiesties Chappel." Edwards, however, had then been dead ten years; neither Grimald nor he reached the age of forty-five. It is fitting that the studies on these two pioneers in the literature of an ill-explored age of transition should have been conceived and produced under the same inspiration. The two volumes are an indication of the important work done in the field of Tudor studies at Yale under Professor Tucker Brooke and Professor Berdan.

Edwards was admitted to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1540, and described as of Somerset by birth, a county with which his contemporary, the musician, Sebastian Westcott, Master of the Paul's Boys, was connected. Six years later he was elected to his lectureship, and then, or soon afterwards, was ordained. His resignation of the rectorship of St. Helen's, Worcester, signed in the house of a London bookseller, Simon Coston, a very near neighbour of Westcott's, probably dates his entry into the royal service under Queen Mary as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal. Six years later, in the third year of Elizabeth, he was made Master of the Children. His reputation as a dramatist, poet and musician stood very high, and he was certainly a *persona grata* with Elizabeth. Of his plays only one, however, has survived, *Damon and Pithias*, but we have unusually

full descriptions of the performances in Christ Church Hall before the Queen in September 1566, of his masterpiece in stage-craft, an elaborate dramatised version of Chaucer's *Palamon and Arcite*. Staged and produced by a Court dramatist before Elizabeth in the hall of the college to which twenty years earlier he had been elected a lecturer, its success must have been doubly gratifying to the author. It was the supreme achievement of his career. But he lived only a few weeks to enjoy his success, dying in October at the early age of 42, to be succeeded at Court as Master of the Children by William Hunnis.

Dr. Bradner is much interested in developments in staging and dramatic technique, for which he justly claims much credit for Edwards. His examination of *Damon and Pithias* and the contemporary records of *Palamon and Arcite* is valuable and detailed. Edwards is an admirable example of what a subsidised producer could do. Oxford spread itself to entertain Elizabeth; but the Shakespearian drama owes its explanation to men and theatres who were not subsidised, Henslowe and the Burbages, and to the patronage of the outer world of mixed audiences. Yet as a predecessor of Lyly and the private houses Edwards repays attention. Peele, perhaps, stands in the same line of development; but not Kyd and Marlowe.

As a poet, Edwards lives by the remarkably beautiful and original poem written on Terence's aphorism: *Amantium iræ amoris red-integratio est* ("The falling out of faithful friends renewing is of love"), by his quaint May poem, and by his delightfully intimate and graceful verses on Queen Mary's eight maids of honour. The text of these and other poems from Cotton MS. Titus A xxiv, from the play, and from the unique copy of *The Paradise* (1576) in the Huntington collection are gathered by Dr. Bradner in an appendix; and his critical examination of Edwards' achievement in poetry and the merits of his anthology form one of his most useful chapters. His touch is sure, and the verses he cites from time to time have precisely the qualities he claims for them. The present writer is particularly glad to have the couplet on Jane Dormer:

Dormer is a darling and of such lively hewe
That who so fedes his eyes on her may sone her bewte rue.

She was one of Mary's maids and married the Count of Feria, a young nobleman in the retinue of Philip of Spain. When, twenty years later, her husband died, a young Englishman printed in

Antwerp, and dedicated to her, More's *Comfort in Tribulation*. The printer, John Fowler, had married the daughter of John Harris, More's secretary, and Dorothy Coly, Margaret Roper's maid.

Dr. Bradner's biographical study of Edwards is on the whole unenterprising. It would have gained in warmth and fullness if he had followed up some of the clues left by Warton. Edwards is unduly isolated from his circle at Oxford, the Court and Lincoln's Inn. In view of the circumstances of Edwards' death the elegies of Turberville and Twyne might have been given and used as evidence; and in omitting all reference to Warton's remark that among "the books of his friend, the late Mr. William Collins of Chichester, now dispersed," was a collection of short comic stories in prose "set forth by Maister Richard Edwardes mayster of her maiesties revels," a side of Edwards' character may have been obscured. One notes in this connection the omission of any reference to Warton's extended examination of the source of the Induction of the *Taming of the Shrew*. If, however, on the biographical side Dr. Bradner has left something for others to do, his critical examination of the poetical and dramatic work of Edwards will take its place as a substantial contribution to the literary history of an interesting period not yet adequately explored.

A. W. REED.

Christopher Marlowe. By U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR. London: Methuen. 1927. Pp. xii+172. 6s.

In this study Miss Ellis-Fermor is not concerned with adding new facts to Marlowe's biography, but with tracing the development of his mind as revealed in his work. No great writer can keep himself out of his work, but few, even the most intimate of lyric poets, unconsciously write their own spiritual autobiographies. The history of Keats' mental growth can be traced in his poetry, but only with the corrective commentary of his letters. To write such an account of Marlowe, without any external assistance, is largely to compose a work of imagination. Miss Ellis-Fermor sees Marlowe as "the Lucretius of the English language," fearlessly confronting the eternal problems and working some of them out in his plays. In *Tamburlane* "the protagonists are ideas more or less adequately

expressed through the minds and characters of men, and it follows that the most vital of these ideas are concerned with the nature of the mind, with its relations to the material universe and to that other vaguer world which seems to envelop man, his motives, his actions and his surroundings, and which Marlowe at this stage still, for the most part, names God." But having thus destroyed for himself "the fundamental notions upon which religion in general—and so life, purpose, hope—is built," in *Dr. Faustus* Marlowe next writes a play "rich in autobiographical suggestion and affords a rare revelation of a mind in reaction against its own former boldness, of a high spirit temporarily shaken into abjectness by spiritual fear." The other plays Miss Ellis-Fermor groups under the heading of "Plays of Policy," tracing in them Marlowe's reaction to the influence of Machiavelli.

Granted that her intuitive conception of Marlowe's personality is true, Miss Ellis-Fermor's book is subtly penetrative; even if she is mistaken, the study is valuable in its suggestiveness and as a welcome reaction against the rather excessive anatomising of Marlowe as a purveyor of textual and bibliographical problems. But her intuition is not always sure, as, for instance, when she says, "As far as Zenocrate is anything at all she is a virtuous, God-fearing Elizabethan matron, and may well bear some resemblance to Catherine Marlowe, the shoemaker's wife of Canterbury, who must, at this stage of Marlowe's life, have been the only woman with whom he had been brought into close and daily contact." The translation of the *Elegies* does not give so domestic an impression; and if we "must" speculate, the remark is not even accurate, for Marlowe had several sisters.

A more serious objection is that Miss Ellis-Fermor rather easily puts aside the evidence that does exist of Marlowe's opinions. Of the charges made by Baines and repeated by Kyd and others, some are foul, some silly; but they are consistent in suggesting a man who was a wild blasphemer—a mad dog in a cage—rather than a bold inquirer, more an unscrupulous and somewhat ineffective adventurer than a serious student of the *Prince*. Other charges impugn Marlowe's personal morals; all can be supported by passages in his works, and it would not be difficult to make out a good case that his attacks on contemporary faith and morality were the result of a perverted mind trying to justify itself.

G. B. HARRISON.

The Complete Works of John Webster. Edited by F. L. LUCAS. London: Chatto & Windus. 1927. 4 vols. 8°. 18s. per volume.

WEBSTER's writings were first collected by Dyce in four volumes in 1830, and this edition was reprinted "revised and corrected" in one volume in December 1857. The same year there appeared another edition in four volumes by W. C. Hazlitt, which has also been reprinted, though I believe without alteration. Dyce's work has the merits as well as the defects that characterise his intrepid pioneering as a whole; Hazlitt's is a perfunctory performance of little value. Some more recent proposals proved abortive, and Webster has had to wait seventy years to find another editor. That he has found an adequate interpreter in Mr. Lucas there can be no doubt, for, whatever incidental criticisms may be passed on these handsome volumes, admirably printed by the Cambridge University Press, they take their place of right among the great editions of English classics that modern scholarship is producing.

From the point of view of literary judgement I do not know that what Mr. Lucas has written about Webster could be bettered. His criticism is at once courageous, sane, and discriminating. He thinks that Rupert Brooke was Webster's best critic because he was his youngest. It is well said, and the same advantage may be claimed for Mr. Lucas's own appreciation. Like Brooke's it has some of the youthful characteristics that may irritate the old, but it is full of the vibrant responsive element, which is the prerogative of the young, and which the years do as much to deaden as to refine. This quality is needed no less for a true critical judgement than for the facile appreciation to which it is popularly directed. And it is eminently needed, if justice is to be done, by a romantic writer like Webster, whose startling effects are always in danger of crashing whenever inspiration is not at its height. But his greatest holds its own, its glamour undiminished by years, and, returning to his work almost thirty years after I first wrote about it, I not only feel that Mr. Lucas has justly seized the essentials of Webster as a dramatist, but agree with him in such minor, but yet significant, judgements as that *The White Devil* is a greater play than *The Duchess of Malfi*.

The sifting of the Jacobean drama from the point of view of authorship, which has gone on apace since the previous editions of

Webster, is reflected in a rather marked manner in these volumes. Not only are *A Cure for a Cuckold* and *Appius and Virginia* subjected to minute analysis, but the investigations of Mr. Dugdale Sykes have convinced Mr. Lucas that Webster had a share in the composition of Middleton's *Anything for a Quiet Life* and the Beaumont and Fletcher *Fair Maid of the Inn* (the rest of which is here ascribed to Massinger and Ford), and these plays are now included in the canon together with the 1615 additions to Overbury's *Characters*. Whatever may be the final verdict on these attributions, there would be no need for anything but gratitude to Mr. Lucas for his excellent reprints, were it not that their inclusion is balanced by serious exclusions elsewhere. He has namely omitted four plays that have commonly found a place among Webster's. *The Thracian Wonder* we need not regret; the ascription possibly rests on a mere blunder, and even Dyce turned it out of his second edition. It is otherwise with the three pieces that admittedly contain Webster's prentice work in collaboration with Dekker: *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, *Westward Ho*, and *Northward Ho*. Mr. Lucas's excuse for excluding them is that it is absurd to go on printing collaborated plays in every edition of each collaborator; and it seems to me very unconvincing. At present the only edition of Dekker's plays is a rather inaccessible reprint more than half a century old, and there may be many readers who would like to have all that Webster wrote but are not particularly interested in Dekker. Mr. Lucas incidentally lets out that for these pieces he has himself had recourse to Hazlitt's *Webster* rather than the more recent and more reliable texts in Pearson's *Dekker*. And does Mr. Lucas think that, because he has here printed Webster's other supposed collaborations, future editors of Middleton and Beaumont and Fletcher will be absolved from including *Anything for a Quiet Life* and *The Fair Maid of the Inn* in their collections? In any case it was hardly necessary for Mr. Lucas to emphasise the incompleteness of his edition by styling it "The Complete Works of John Webster"!

The introductions and commentaries to the various works are not only admirable as literature and criticism, but are monuments of erudition and patient labour. Possibly readers who want their author's meaning expounded with the least trouble to themselves will sometimes grumble at the copious accumulation of not always very relevant information, but those whose interest lies rather with the whole vast field of Jacobean language, life, and thought will feel

that they owe Mr. Lucas a very great debt of gratitude. One point of peculiar interest is the attempt to define the staging of the various scenes.

The text, necessarily I suppose, represents that compromise, never wholly satisfactory, between diplomatic reprint and readable version, which is characteristic of the modern "critical" edition. It is on the whole very conservative, but in some details a trifle eccentric. The spelling is in general scrupulously preserved; the punctuation too, unless it is misleading. But the modernisation of the use of *u* and *v* and of *i* and *j* will cause a slight feeling of discomfort in readers sufficiently familiar with Jacobean spelling to take it as a matter of course. Mr. Lucas appears, indeed, to be somewhat impatient of the demands of minute conservatism, but, speaking as one who is not likely to underrate their importance, I should say that he has himself gone rather too far in that direction. Certainly his pages are liberally sprinkled with brackets and caret-marks, and though the printer has done his best to render these diacritics unobtrusive, they remain both unsightly and disturbing, and they are, I believe, unnecessary. At least I think that to have printed at the foot of the page just those readings of the original which had been altered in the text would have been at once more enlightening and less unpleasing. There are two classes of alterations that are bracketed in the text but left unrecorded in the notes. The first of these consists of literal errors: "such as turned 'u'," says Mr. Lucas, though in fact several other sorts are included. Now, it is a moot point whether an editor is not justified in correcting such errors silently, but I think most people will agree that if he is going to advertise the alteration at all he should inform the reader what the alteration is. Besides there are traps for the unwary. In the reprint of the title-page of *Monuments of Honour* occur the words: "His Maiesties Li[eu]tenant ouer this His Roy[a]ll Chamber". The notes offer no explanation of these brackets, and as the only copy of the original is in California few readers will have the opportunity to discover what Mr. Lucas has been up to. In point of fact the original reads "*Liuetenant*" and "*Royoll*". The latter is of course a mere slip, but the former presumably stands for "*Livetenant*" and is not a misprint for the French form but a phonetic spelling of the English. The other class of unrecorded though bracketed alterations consists of modernisations of certain common Jacobean spellings which Mr. Lucas considers misleading. Several of these seem to me clearly

injudicious. I see no more reason to alter "president" to "precedent" than to alter "counsaile" to "council" or many other ambiguous spellings, and no more reason to alter "ere" to "e'er" than to alter "Ile" to "I'll"; and I am sure that any reader not a mere tyro in English literature would be rather puzzled at meeting such a spelling as "e'er" in a Jacobean play, did not the enclosing brackets warn him of the misplaced ingenuity of the editor. It almost looks as though Mr. Lucas began by regarding these spellings as misprints and only later discovered that they were normal. There is perhaps more to be said for altering "of" to "off" and "to" to "too" where necessary, for these are trifling irregularities that often do obscure the sense; but, granting this, I am all the less convinced of the need of annoying the reader by such angularities as "of[f]" and "to[o]." It would have been far more useful and far less irritating to have printed a list of all such alterations at the end of the notes. Finally, if there was any sense in altering "&" to "[et]" there was surely none in recording it in the notes!

The real objection to the system is that when you stumble over Mr. Lucas's brackets you have first to turn to another part of the volume for enlightenment, and the chances are on the whole against your finding any. You are then left wondering whether the editor has been merely correcting an obvious typographical error or playing pranks with his author's spelling. And he does not even use his own system altogether consistently; for instance, when he corrects "frequently" to "frequently" he only puts the *qu* in brackets, but when he alters "receited" to "recited" he encloses the whole word. Inconsistent, too, is his practice in reprinting title-pages. In many cases he keeps long *s* and old *i* and *u* (for *j* and *v*), all contrary to his declared intention; but in the title to *The White Devil* he only keeps long *s*, and modernises the rest. On one of the half-titles to *The Devil's Law-Case* (Mr. Lucas indulges in the luxury of two!) he has the form "DEVILS", an atrocity which I had hoped the C.U.P. had learned better than to perpetrate. Mr. Lucas is clearly rather bored by textual technicalities, and while he has conscientiously endeavoured to work out a possible system, he has failed to carry it out satisfactorily in detail.

The arrangement of the text of the plays follows the originals very closely, including marginal directions and even in one place an erratic change to smaller type. The results are a little queer. For the originals are quite arbitrary in sometimes printing verse

continuously, with speakers' names in the middle of lines, and sometimes dividing the lines between speeches. These aberrations are retained; on the other hand, misdivisions of the verse are corrected. The print-lines of the reprint (disregarding overruns) are then numbered. This numbering, therefore, represents neither the print-lines of the original nor the verse-lines of the scene. Mr. Lucas will reply that this is anyhow the common practice as regards prose. I am inclined to think that the plea is a good one, but it is unusual, and I do not feel certain that the editor had any clear idea of what he was doing.

The text has evidently been set up from photographic copy, and, so far as I have checked it, is admirably accurate. I fear, however, that this must be credited to the printer rather than to the editor, for where the latter may be presumed responsible accuracy tends to diminish. Thus where transcripts are given of the title-pages of later editions of *The White Devil* dated 1631, 1665, and 1672, they contain eight, eleven, and four errors respectively. It is further evident that in some respects Mr. Lucas's equipment as a textual critic is not yet quite complete. This appears from his remarks on a careful record of the variant readings found in copies of the first edition of *The White Devil* (though it is not quite clear how far he has made his own collation of these and how far he has relied on Dyce). For he seems to imply that Okes printed part of the edition, then stopped to make corrections (the whole type being still standing), then printed the rest of the edition; whereas, of course, alterations were made in the several sheets successively as they went through the press. Moreover, the gathering of corrected and uncorrected sheets would be governed by chance rather than a solicitude for fairness to purchasers, the true unit of collation is the forme not the signature, and the assumption that obvious misprints show the earlier state is sometimes misleading.

The "Selected Bibliography" is a useful record with some erratic features. Mr. Lucas might have informed us whether his references to Dyce were to the earlier or the revised edition, for he does not appear to distinguish them in his notes. It is rather strange, too, that while he includes Robert Prölss's *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (under 1881—it should be 1880-3; ii. 2, the English section, appeared in 1882), he makes no mention of Creizenach's work with the same title, though it is unquestionably the standard book for the period it covers. Under *Sir Thomas Wyatt* an obscure edition of 1876 is

recorded, but the standard reprint of this as well as *Westward Ho* and *Northward Ho* in Pearson's *Dekker*, 1873, is ignored. Under *The Duchess of Malfi* the variant of the 1640 edition with Waterson's name in the imprint is not recorded, and the transcripts of the title-pages of later editions are incomplete. Under *Appius and Virginia* it should have been mentioned that there are two different imprints of 1654, besides the titles of 1659 and 1679. Ignorance of this fact has led Mr. Lucas into an impatient criticism of Rupert Brooke. "I do not know", he writes (iii. 134), "why there should have been all this mystery about the publisher of the first Quarto of 1654. It is only necessary to look at a copy." Certainly, if you happen to look at a copy bearing Marriot's name; but Brooke evidently looked at a copy with the unenlightening imprint: "Printed in the Year 1654"! A little more experience might have suggested to Mr. Lucas that his information was possibly defective. The title-page of *The Malcontent* is nowhere reproduced. Further, one is left to wonder why Gifford's *Jonson* of 1816 was preferred to Cunningham's revision of 1875 as an authority for reference; why Arber's reprint of *Euphues* was used, although Bond's *Lyly* was consulted for the plays; and why a Cambridge scholar should refer to the Oxford *Shakespeare*, when the Cambridge text (Globe) is the recognised standard.

I append a handful of miscellaneous notes.

Life. In giving the entries from Henslowe's diary Mr. Lucas has omitted to indicate which belong to the Admiral's men and which to Worcester's. Surely it is a matter of some biographical interest what company his author was writing for.

White Devil. Title. It is erroneous to represent Worcester's company, which became Queen Anne's, as the same as that heard of in 1555, and much worse to confuse Queen Anne's with Queen Elizabeth's, as from his queer reference to Chambers Mr. Lucas appears to have done.

II. i. 112: "growing to [a] souldier?" Of course "souldier" is a noun and not a verb, but that is no reason why it should need an article.

Duchess of Malfi. Actors' names. The statement that Rice "does not appear in any King's lists before 1620" is incorrect; he acted in *Barnavel* in August 1619. T. W. Baldwin dates the revival of the *Duchess* c. 1623, evidently because Pallant appears to have joined the company in 1622. I do not understand why the

latter should not have acted " Court Officers " as well as Cariola and the Doctor.

Textual Notes. The peculiarity, incidentally recorded, that the quartos " print at the head of each scene all the persons who appear in it " raises one of the profoundest puzzles of dramatic bibliography. Mr. Lucas's comment, " It is probably due to the first edition having been set up from a prompt-copy ", only shows that he is unfamiliar with prompt copies.

Appius and Virginia. I think a protest should be made against Mr. Lucas's verdict on Heywood. Judging that he was called upon for a comparison of the latter's work with Webster's, he read through the six volumes of Pearson's reprint " simply from this point of view ", and he writes :

there is a peculiar oafish simplicity about him which made him unable ever to create a single piece . . . which is not deformed by pages of utter drivel. Let those who suspect exaggeration in this, read through, for instance, if they can, *A Challenge for Beauty*.

Obviously reading a single play will not help towards a judgement on all. The splenetic dictum would seem to be the outcome not of criticism but of indigestion. I doubt whether Heywood drivelled more than his fellow-dramatists ; and most readers find some at least of his plays, taken in reasonable doses, readable enough, perhaps more so than Webster's minor work. To Lamb he was " a prose Shakespeare," to Bullen " dear Tom Heywood " ; and, if we admit that these were perhaps uncritical enthusiasts, for Mr. Lucas to interject (albeit of a particular play) " un sot trouve toujours un plus sot pour le lire ", is not only impertinent but silly.

III. iv. 31 : " John " (or " Ihon ") for " Iper " seems reasonable enough, but to say that the confusion of *h* and *p* is " of the commonest " is, I suspect, contrary to fact.

Verses to Munday (iii. 263). Munday is first mentioned by Henslowe in December 1597, not in 1594.

Malcontent. Is not the inference (p. 294) that the Queen's Revels lost the book of the play rather rash ? Probably it had been already published when the King's men acted it. If not, we know that there were other ways of obtaining a text. Further, *Jerónimo* is hardly a comedy (p. 307) though it may be burlesque, and it is not quite certain that " the King's Men could not lay any claim to " *The Spanish Tragedy*.

II. 16-17. It is interesting to find Mr. Lucas noting that Sinklo

was "something of a skeleton". The theme has been elaborately developed by A. Gaw in *Anglia* (N.F. xxxvii. 289).

Appendix III. Mr. Lucas has fallen into a slight confusion over the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*. He records a suggestion "that the additions paid for [by Henslowe to Jonson in 1601-2] are not the passages quoted above [the additions printed in 1602], but other more extensive alterations made earlier". The suggestion on the contrary is that the printed additions were written earlier than Jonson's. But I am afraid that further investigation suggests that the arguments of "the editors of the Malone Society Reprint" are less conclusive than we supposed when we ventured to put them forward.

W. W. GREG.

The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. An attempt to determine their respective shares and the shares of others. By E. H. C. OLIPHANT. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1927. Pp. xv+553. 23s.

MR. E. H. C. OLIPHANT has long been recognised as a leading authority on the authorship of the plays printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher folios by reason of the series of articles on these plays contributed by him to *Englische Studien* in 1890-1891. The files of that periodical being inaccessible to students in this country except those within reach of the British Museum or other great library, there will be many whose knowledge of his work has hitherto been limited to the references made to it in the standard text-books on the Elizabethan drama and who will gratefully welcome the appearance of this volume, in which the author has embodied the substance of the *Englische Studien* articles with such revisions and additions as have been prompted by further consideration of the plays and of the critical work devoted to them during the period (upwards of thirty-five years) that has elapsed since the original articles were written.

The first Beaumont and Fletcher folio, containing 34 plays and a masque, was published by Humphrey Moseley in 1647, thirty-one years after Beaumont's death and twenty-two after Fletcher's. It does not profess to be a complete edition of the plays of Beaumont

and Fletcher; it professes to contain all their plays (with the exception of *The Wild-goose Chase*, of which Moseley had been unable to obtain a copy) that had not been printed before, seventeen having already been printed separately in quarto. In the second folio, which was published thirty-two years later, in 1679, the seventeen plays omitted from the first folio are included and also *The Wild-goose Chase*, bringing the total number of plays to fifty-two. This does profess to be a complete edition, to contain "all both Tragedies and Comedies that were ever writ by our Authours, a pair of the greatest Wits and most ingenious Poets of their age." Not a word is said by the publisher of either folio to suggest that any dramatist but Beaumont and Fletcher had a hand in any of the plays.

Until well into the nineteenth century the two volumes were unquestioningly accepted as the authentic works of Beaumont and Fletcher, and it was generally assumed that the collaboration of the two authors was of so intimate a kind, that their styles were so similar and their work so closely interwoven that it was impossible to distinguish between them. It was not until little more than fifty years ago that the problem of the authorship of the plays was first approached in a scientific manner. The first real attempt to tackle it was made by F. G. Fleay in 1874. In a paper read before The New Shakspeare Society in that year he endeavoured by the application of metrical tests to separate the work of Beaumont from that of Fletcher, and also to identify the shares of Massinger and the other contributors to the plays contained in the folios. The conclusions formed by Fleay, though in some instances they have been rejected or modified, have in the main been corroborated by later critics, and Mr. Oliphant pays to him the tribute he well deserves as pioneer in a field that until his time had remained unexplored. In 1882-1886 Fleay was followed by Robert Boyle, who carefully worked over the ground again, checking Fleay's tests and amplifying them in many important respects. It is in the identification of Massinger's share in the plays that Boyle's work is especially valuable. He devoted the most minute attention to Massinger's versification and diction, and noting as one of his most marked characteristics his habit of repeating himself, which he does in a manner and to an extent that can be paralleled in no other dramatist of the time, he applied in addition to other tests this repetition test, which not only in most instances afforded the most striking confirmation of the results

derived from the verse-tests but enabled the detection of Massinger's hand in many instances in which these tests proved inconclusive or where they were inapplicable. The value of Boyle's work has not, I think, been sufficiently recognised. It was certainly not acknowledged by Fleay, who appears to have resented Boyle's investigations as an unwarrantable intrusion upon his own particular field of study, and Mr. Oliphant also seems inclined to underrate it. More than once in the present volume he refers slightly to Boyle, and it is, I think, at least a little unfortunate that in his introduction to this book he should have repeated from *Englische Studien* the assertion that so far as Massinger's share in the plays is concerned Boyle trusted principally to "the repetition of well-worn phrases," a statement which drew an indignant protest from Boyle at the time it was first made, and which is certainly not true, unless by "well-worn phrases" is meant—what no ordinary reader would take it to mean—phrases well worn by Massinger himself.

Since the publication of Mr. Oliphant's original paper in the early nineties of last century, no critic has attempted to re-examine in detail the whole collection of plays contained in the folios, a task which he has here undertaken and accomplished with a thoroughness and unflagging energy which must excite the admiration of all his readers.

The chief respect in which Mr. Oliphant differs from most other "Beaumont and Fletcher" experts is that he attributes to Beaumont a far larger share in the plays than they do, and assigns the commencement both of his and Fletcher's dramatic activity to an earlier period, believing that both were writing for the stage before 1605. The plays usually accepted as wholly or in part by Beaumont are only nine in number, *The Woman-Hater*, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, *The Coxcomb*, *Philaster*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, *A King and no King*, *Cupid's Revenge*, *The Scornful Lady*, and—though some would reject this—*The Captain*. Mr. Oliphant finds his hand present in no fewer than seventeen, adding to the above *Beggars' Bush*, *Love's Cure*, *Love's Pilgrimage*, *The Nice Valour*, *The Noble Gentleman*, *Thierry and Theodoret*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and *Wit at several Weapons*. Many critics are of opinion that there are four plays, three included in the first folio and one in the second only, with which neither Beaumont nor Fletcher was in any way concerned, the plays in question being *The Laws of Candy*, *Love's Cure*, *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, and *The*

Coronation. Mr. Oliphant, however, finds that apart from *The Coronation* (known to be Shirley's, and reclaimed by him) there is not a single play in either folio which does not contain work by one or other of the two dramatists, and only one, *Love's Cure*, in which Fletcher had not a share. In his introduction the author remarks that students of the Elizabethan drama may be divided into two classes, those that "make the external evidence subordinate to the internal" and those that "reverse the process," and tells us that he "ranges himself with the latter." What this means in the present case is that he accepts Moseley's publication of the plays as Beaumont and Fletcher's as the strongest possible *prima facie* evidence that one or other of them had a hand in every play, and this notwithstanding the fact that Moseley, if not a "fraudulent bookseller" as Malone bluntly calls him, is known to have published a number of other plays under the names of persons other than those by whom they were written. And in attempting to establish Moseley's good faith in regard to the publication of the first folio, Mr. Oliphant makes on his behalf a claim which is clearly not maintainable. What Moseley claims, he says, is not that his volume contains no work by others than Beaumont and Fletcher, but "that a play in his folio is entitled to be there inasmuch as it contains an appreciable proportion of the work either of Beaumont or Fletcher." To refute this statement it is only necessary to examine the title-page and Moseley's preface. In the title-page the contents of the volume are described as "Comedies and Tragedies Written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Gentlemen. Never printed before, And now published by the Authours Originall Copies"; in his preface Moseley says that the volume does not contain "anything spurious or impos'd," that he "had the Originalls from such as received them from the Authours themselves," that "here's nothing but what is genuine and Theirs," that, besides the plays previously printed, "there is not any Piece written by these Authours, either Joyntly or Severally, but what are now publish'd to the World in this Volume," and finally (in a passage not quoted by Mr. Oliphant) "that were the Authours living . . . they themselves would challenge neither more nor lesse than what is here published." In face of this preface it cannot be maintained that Moseley did not intend to convey to his readers that all the plays he had printed were written by Beaumont and Fletcher either jointly or severally, and by them alone.

While Mr. Oliphant treats the evidence of Moseley with a respect

to which, in view of his record as a publisher, it is clearly not entitled, he pays scant attention to that of Sir Aston Cokaine, who made two most emphatic protests against the publication of the first folio under the joint names of Beaumont and Fletcher. He does indeed quote from the verses addressed to his cousin, Charles Cotton, the lines :

Had Beaumont liv'd when this Edition came
Forth, and beheld his own living name
Before plays that he never writ, how he
Had frown'd and blush'd at such impiety !

but he omits the concluding lines containing the most forcible part of the protest :

. . . What a foul
And unexcusable fault it is (*that whole*
Volume of Plays being almost every one
After the death of Beaumont writ) that none
Would certify them so much. I wish as free
Y'had told the Printers this, as you did me.

It is to Cokaine, who was an intimate friend of Massinger's, that we owe the only external evidence that Massinger was Fletcher's partner in some of the plays, evidence which has been abundantly confirmed by the investigations of modern critics. He also tells us that he had been informed by "Fletcher's chief bosom-friend" that the larger number of the 34 plays in this first folio (which in fact contains eleven of the sixteen now attributed to Fletcher alone) were "the sole issues of sweet Fletcher's brain." But his most important statement, so far as Beaumont's participation in the plays contained in this folio is concerned, is that "almost every one" of these plays was written after Beaumont's death, a statement little wide of the mark if, according to the view generally held, only six of these thirty-four plays were written before 1616, but quite irreconcilable with Mr. Oliphant's dating of eighteen of them back to Beaumont's lifetime.

During recent years perhaps the most important fresh results yielded by the investigations of other scholars which seem likely to find acceptance have been the ascription to Field (in place of Beaumont) of the Induction and first two "Triumphs" of *Four Plays in One*, and the addition of Webster and Ford to the number of dramatists concerned in the collection. Mr. Oliphant, who formerly attributed *The Triumph of Honour* to Field and *The Triumph of Love* to Beaumont, now accepts Field's authorship of both pieces ; he endorses the identification of Webster's hand in *The Fair Maid of the Inn* and *The Honest Man's Fortune*, and of Ford's in the former

play and *The Laws of Candy*. *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, previously ascribed by him to Beaumont, Massinger, Rowley and Fletcher, he now allots in the main to Massinger, Webster and Ford, but still finds Fletcher's hand present (with Ford's) in the very small portion before awarded to Fletcher alone, though it is precisely in this portion that the distinctive marks of Ford's vocabulary and phrasing are most manifest. *The Honest Man's Fortune* he assigns to Tourneur, Webster, Massinger, Field and Fletcher. There is, I think, little doubt of the participation of four of the five, but the ascription of Act I. and part of Act II. to Tourneur, which rests on no firmer basis than their alleged metrical resemblance to *The Atheist's Tragedy*, must be regarded as exceedingly dubious. The problem of *The Laws of Candy* has been brought much nearer a satisfactory solution by Mr. William Wells, who has shown that it exhibits a number of striking parallels (here recorded) with Ford's dramas. Mr. Oliphant now assigns it—"save for one little bit of Fletcher"—wholly to Ford. The style of the bulk of the play seems to me, however, incompatible with Ford's sole authorship.

In many instances Mr. Oliphant's allocations of authorship (which, as before, are sometimes very intricate) differ considerably from those published in his *Englische Studien* paper, and in particular he omits Beaumont and Massinger from several pieces in which he formerly believed them to have had a share.

Included in the body of the work are discussions of five plays—*Sir Thomas Stukeley*, *Henry VIII*, *Julius Caesar*, *The Birth of Merlin* and *Double Falsehood*—which (since none has any early ascription to Beaumont and Fletcher or traditional association with the name of either) might well have been relegated to an appendix. The anonymous *Stukeley* finds a place because Mr. Oliphant has elsewhere expressed his conviction that it contains early work of Fletcher's, an opinion which he here retracts. *Henry VIII* is assigned to Shakespeare and Fletcher with some slight revision by Massinger, and *Julius Caesar* to Marlowe, Shakespeare and Beaumont. In attributing a share in this play to Beaumont Mr. Oliphant follows Mr. William Wells, who (*The Authorship of "Julius Caesar,"* 1923) holds it to be a revision mainly by Beaumont of an earlier play of Marlowe's. Beaumont's participation is here limited to a share (with Shakespeare) in I. 2 and IV. 2 only. *The Birth of Merlin*, printed as Shakespeare's and Rowley's in 1662 and containing a number of passages in common with *Cupid's Revenge* is (again

following Mr. Wells) assigned to Beaumont, Fletcher and Rowley.

Far more surprising than any of these attributions is Mr. Oliphant's acceptance of *Double Falsehood*, both on external and internal evidence, as partly Shakespeare's. Published in 1728 as "written originally by W. Shakespeare and now revised and adapted to the stage by Mr. Theobald," he identifies it in its original form with the lost *Cardenno* or *Cardenio* credited by Moseley to Shakespeare and Fletcher in 1653, and accordingly believes it to be Theobald's revision of a Shakespeare-Fletcher play. Of Mr. Oliphant's championship of Theobald's honesty there is no room to speak here; to me, at least, there seems every reason to doubt it, the statements made in Theobald's preface to the play not bearing the impress of truth. So far as the alleged internal evidence of Shakespeare's hand is concerned, Mr. Oliphant, beyond the quotation of a few lines which he considers characteristically Shakespearean, offers us nothing tangible but the remark that "The use of 'heirs' as a verb" at the beginning of the play "seems to point to Shakespeare." Duke Angelo here (i. i. 7-9) observes that he would wish to leave "the garland of his honours" to his son "flourishing and green"—

. . . worthy the man
Who, with my dukedom, heirs my better glories.

But it is not Shakespeare, it is Theobald, who uses the word "heirs" in this way. In *The Fatal Secret*, iv. i. the Cardinal of Arragon tells Pescara that he is content for him to hold the Duchess of Malfi's treasure "in our young nephew's right who heirs her Dukedom," whereupon Pescara exclaims, "And may he heir her virtues!" Not here, at any rate, have we any evidence of Shakespeare's hand.

I have noted two mistakes. On p. 33, Darley—as previously in *Englische Studien*—is quoted as saying that the extra (eleventh) syllable characteristic of Fletcher's verse cannot be "lapt under the teeth," but stands out as a substantive part of the verse. What Darley actually says is that it cannot be "lapt under the tenth"—i.e. the tenth syllable.

The other mistake is of more importance since it affects the identification of *The Mayor of Queenborough* with the early *Valtiger* or *Henges* (possibly alternative names of the same play) mentioned in Henslowe's Diary among the pieces performed by the Admiral's

men in 1596 and 1597. Mr. Oliphant (p. 119) speaks of *The Mayor of Queenborough* as having been "vouched for" by the publisher as "the 'first flight' of the author." This is not so. What the publisher says is this :

You have the first flight of him, I assure you. This *Mayor of Queenborough*, whom you have all heard of, and some of you beheld upon the stage, now begins to walk abroad in print : he has been known sufficiently by the reputation of his wit, which is enough, by the way, to distinguish him from ordinary mayors ; but wit, you know, has skulked in corners for many years past. . . .

Clearly the publisher is here speaking of the "first flight," not of the author, but of the play. All have heard of this Mayor, some have beheld him on the stage, now he "begins to walk abroad in print," and it is this "walking abroad in print"—the first publication of the play—that is his "first flight."

The book is admirably planned and full of useful information relative to the publication of the plays, entries in the Stationers' Register, early booksellers' ascriptions, and so forth. Not the least valuable of its features is the full record it contains of the views of other critics, some of them previously unpublished. Future students of the "Beaumont and Fletcher" plays will find it indispensable.

H. DUGDALE SYKES.

The Court Masque. By ENID WELSFORD. Cambridge University Press. 1927. Pp. ix+434. 25s. net.

MISS WELSFORD indicates the main purpose of her book in the subtitle, "A study in the relationship between Poetry and the Revels," and she maps out her survey under three heads. She treats first the origin and history of the Masque, tracing its development from the *momerie* ; her second section is a critical study, much of it admirably written, of the influence of the Masque on poetry and drama ; her third section, entitled "The Significance of the Revels," and launching out into a discussion of "the function of art and its relation to ordinary life," is a rather mystifying attempt to base some kind of esthetic on a study of the form. I cannot but feel that her book would have gained in value and suggestiveness if she had omitted

her first chapter and the whole of her third section. Her contribution to history and criticism would have stood out clearer. What the heathen origin of the May Day festival or the uses of imitative magic by primeval savages have to do with Renaissance Italy or Tudor and Stuart England is hard to see. The Masque was a late and highly sophisticated form of art. And the inner philosophy of it was much more tersely summed up by James the First at the performance of *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, when he bawled at the masquers, "What did you bring me here for? Devil take you all! Dance!"

The *momerie* is well discussed, and Miss Welsford analyses minutely and very exactly the use and meaning of all the technical terms, *momerie*, *mascherata*, *entremets* and "disguising," distinguishing their original forms and noting their developments. Particularly good is her discussion of Hall's account of Henry VIII's masque of 1512 (pp. 130-138).

The Masque proper is treated historically. Separate chapters are devoted to the reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I. The work is skilfully done, but there is one grave omission. Miss Welsford is, of course, well aware of Jonson's debt to the classics, and quotes more than once the militant preface of *Hymenæi*, but in the working out of his technique his claim to produce "high and hearty inventions . . . grounded upon antiquity and solid learning" is virtually ignored, and Miss Welsford devotes herself to the task of finding in him some affinity with Italian artists. In this field of research she has done original work; she first pointed out, for instance, Inigo Jones's borrowings from Parigi. For *The Masque of Blackness* and *The Vision of Delight* she finds sources, or at least close analogues, in the Florentine entertainment at Francesco de' Medici's wedding to Bianca Cappello in 1579. The evidence is far from clear. The starting-point of *The Masque of Blackness* was Queen Anne's fancy to appear as a blackamoor. This cue suggested to Jonson how to give a new turn to the masque convention of the wandering foreigner. Nymphs from Nigeria, the blackest people on earth, win their way to the white cliffs of Albion. The classics are worked in at every turn—for example, the Phaethon myth in Ovid: the Ethiopians were originally white till Phaethon burnt them black; a healing power might whiten them again. The one point of contact with the Italian is the machinery of the great concave shell like mother-of-pearl which brought in the masquers. Inigo

Jones may have known of the Florentine entertainment, and we can imagine at a preliminary discussion between the two designers Jonson asking, "Can you contrive a sea?" and Inigo answering, "Yes, as they did it at Florence"; but this is at most an important detail of the setting. For *The Vision of Delight* Miss Welsford works out her parallels. In her enumeration of these (p. 202), the invocation of night, the eulogies of prince and nobles as the wonder of their age, and the final appearance of Aurora, are pure convention. As to the last point, how otherwise could night end than with the dawn? To take a detail in which Miss Welsford detects copying: in the masque Night calls on Phantasy to create a stream of airy forms.

And though it be a waking dream,
Yet let it like an odour rise
To all the Senses here,
And fall like sleep upon their eyes,
Or music in their ear.

The Italian parallel is Night asleep in her car, and below her shadows and phantasms, and "delle loro bocche vsciua vn negro fumo ma di soauo odore." This is from the picture of the Cave of Sleep in Statius' *Thebais*, x. 109-10. The god lies asleep,

supraque torum niger efflat anhelus
Ore vapor.

The context supplies the phantasms, "noctis opaca cohors." Statius is weakly copying the beautiful description of Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* (xi. 592, following). Jonson had both these originals at his call if he needed them, but between his ethereal verse and the grotesque fumes which are depicted pouring in wreaths from the spirits' mouths in the engraving reproduced in Plate V, I can see no resemblance. But it certainly helps one to understand the point of Jonson's favourite antithesis between the "soul" and the "bodily part" of a masque.

Miss Welsford conjectures (p. 187) that this question of Italian borrowings was one of the causes of quarrel between Jonson and Jones. If so, why was Jonson silent about Italy in the *Expostulation*?* In that long-drawn tirade he, like the incensed client in *Punch*, "left nothing out." The sneer at "Italian herbs" in

* Miss Welsford quotes from a bad text of this poem (p. 252). For

What need of prose,
Or verse or prose, t'express immortal you?

read "Or verse, or sense." For "The *Ἐκρηγοποιός*" read "The *Ἐκκευκοποιός*."

Hymenæi cannot possibly refer to Jones. Jonson paid a tribute to him in the Quarto text of that masque, as he did earlier in *The Masque of Blackness* and later in the *The Masque of Queens*. The preponderance of the Italian element in Court masques after Jonson was discarded is easily explained; Jonson was a constructive artist, Townshend and Davenant were not, and it simplified their task if they gave Inigo his head.

Miss Welsford offers new identifications of three of the Chatsworth drawings. She suggests that designs 44 and 45 in the Walpole Society's Catalogue are for the Temple in *Albion's Triumph*, and so are wrongly placed among the sketches for *The Masque of Oberon*. This suggestion overrides one of Mr. C. F. Bell's most important elucidations of the drawings: he sorted out the whole series into two groups before and after Inigo's second visit to Italy in 1613-14, when he fell under the influence of Guercino.* These two designs are early work, perhaps later than the *Oberon* drawings, but not so late as 1632. Further, the outline of the Temple in *Albion's Triumph* is lightly sketched on the *verso* of design 120 (the Diana of that masque), and it is not the Oberon pattern. The ruined basilica of design 198 is a puzzle which has already misled one critic. It would be a beautiful setting for a Triumph of Time. Miss Welsford proposes to identify it with the "Temple of the Cock seated by the haven of the City of Sleep" in *Luminalia*, from which "Mariners or Master Mates" issued "in rich habits." But the Temple of the Cock was no mysterious pendant to the City of Sleep. It was in sharp contrast to it—a setting that points to a scene of waking life with the clarion of the cock and the stir of the sailors' entrance.

There is good criticism in the chapters which work out the influence of the Masque on other literary forms, but a theory is pushed very far when the Masque is held to justify "Shakespeare's blending of lyricism and drama, of realism and romance," and *King Lear* is swept into its orbit. Spenser and Milton, on the other hand, are treated very suggestively from this point of view; and is not the real explanation of this that the Masque was spectacular, not dramatic? But, as Miss Welsford says, this is a theme for treatment in a book, not in a chapter. It might begin quite early. Long ago Warton noted † that Skelton's *Bouge of Court* was modelled on the form of the contemporary pageant.

* *Designs of Inigo Jones*, p. 25.

† *The History of English Poetry*, 1778, vol. iii, p. 347.

The last section of the book is treated under the three heads of "Mumming," "Misrule," and "Hymen." But what had the Lord of Misrule to do with the Masque? Miss Welsford herself notes that the *sotie* is the "direct antithesis of the Masque" (p. 388), and that the Masque "never developed the subtler traits of fool comedy" (p. 391). How could it do this? The all-licensed fool would have dealt some shattering blows at the choicest make-believe of courtly homage.

Elisa's eyes are blessed stars,
Inducing peace, subduing wars.
Elisa's hand is crystal-bright,
Her words are balm, her looks are light.

But what if Touchstone had turned the rhyme, or Lear's Fool stood by to comment?

The book is enriched with fine illustrations, but they have some serious errors of ascription. These are corrected here on the high authority of Mr. Bell. The Iris "for an Italian entertainment" (the second figure of the frontispiece) belongs to a series of drawings and sketches, four hundred and twenty-seven in number, for a magnificent street pageant, "*La Genealogia degli Dei*," performed in Florence at the marriage of Francesco de' Medici and Giovanna d'Austria in 1565. All these designs, bound in three volumes, are now in the Gabinetto delle Stampe of the Uffizi. The absurdity of attributing them to Vasari has long been recognised; it is now generally agreed that they were made in the studio of the Allori, probably under the direction of Alessandro Allori himself. The Car of Mercury, reproduced by Miss Welsford in Plate III, is one of the same set, so that the attribution to Parigi, or, even less fortunately, to Buontalenti, is wide of the mark. On the other hand, she is right in stating that the original of Plate IV, Mercury and other allegorical figures, is "probably by Buontalenti," for it is one of a series of water-colours by him, all fully authenticated, and several of them signed. The Italian entertainment with which she loosely connects it was the Intermedi to a performance of Bargagli's comedy, *La Pellegrina*, played at Florence during the marriage festivities of Ferdinando de' Medici and Christina of Lorraine in 1589. These drawings are well known to students from the publications of Warburg (1895) and Solerti (1905).

PERCY SIMPSON.

Plays and Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles. By MARY SUSAN STEELE. Yale University Press. 1926. Pp. xiii+300. 18s.

THIS book is a chronological list, with brief references to the authorities, of dramatic performances at the English Court from 1558 to 1642. Like so many doctorate theses, it is a pure compilation. Miss Steele "records all the divergencies" of the authorities, but does not sift them. Machyn's *Diary* is oddly quoted on p. 13 in the form that the "masket" of February 1, 1562, was performed by "a C. and d^{re} gorgyously be-sene": the *g* refers to a footnote in Nichols, whom she copies mechanically, to the effect that "C. and d." means 150. On p. 65 the mysterious number "6" printed above "A large Maske" is correctly taken from Feuillerat, but it is left hanging in the air without an explanatory note that it means six masquers. *Pan's Anniversary* should be dated January 17, 1620.* *The Theatre of Apollo* by Sir John Beaumont, edited by Dr. Greg in 1926, probably appeared too late to be inserted. The book as a whole will be a useful work of reference, especially for performances after 1616, where Sir E. K. Chambers stops.

P. S.

Covent Garden Drollery: A Miscellany of 1672. Edited by G. THORN DRURY. P. J. and A. E. Dobell. 1928. Four hundred copies printed (Nos. 1-50 on hand-made paper). 12s. net.

THE verse miscellanies of the second half of the seventeenth century may be compared to a vast, and sometimes, it may be confessed, a rank jungle into the tangled labyrinths of which few modern explorers have ventured. Nevertheless a voyage of discovery into this little-known country will repay all who are interested in the history of English poetry, for, although the anthologies of the Protectorate and the Restoration never reach the supreme heights of the great Elizabethan and Jacobean collections, they contain much poetry of high merit, as well as a great deal of verse that has immense interest for the literary and the social historian. Hitherto they have been very

* See *Notes and Queries*, 1st series, xii, p. 485; Thomas Cooke's bill quoted in the *Oxford Jonson*, i, 235; and the *Calendar of Venetian State Papers*, 1620, pp. 138, 190. The doubt about the date has been cleared up by Mr. W. J. Lawrence.

inaccessible, as the original editions are exceedingly rare, and the few reprints edited by Ebsworth in the nineteenth century are very unsatisfactory from the point of view of modern scholarship.

No study of the literature of the Restoration can be considered adequate without reference to the *Drolleries*, that series of sprightly, if not very delicate, anthologies which represent better perhaps than any other publications of the period the spirit of those Town Gallants, the heroes of the comedies of Wycherley and Etherege, the young gentlemen of wit and fashion, who "lived very high under Oliver," and realised in some sort their ideal of a life of pleasure and gallantry after the Restoration. The contents of these books are mostly the kind of verses of which Milton must have been thinking when he wrote of "work raised from the heat of youth, or the vapours of wine; . . . which flows at waste from the pen of some vulgar amourist, or the trencher fury of a rhyming parasite." There are generally a number of neatly turned prologues and epilogues; there are always love songs (from Court and "both Theaters"), often indecent, but sometimes of great beauty, drinking catches, some coarse satires on the "Fanaticks" or Puritans, frequently a Mad Song supposed to be sung by *Tom of Bedlam*, and finally one or two "Scotch Songs" and some examples of what purport to be verses in English country dialect. A full investigation of the circumstances under which the *Drolleries* were compiled with a satisfactory explanation for the presence of these different elements would provide a most valuable chapter in that complete history of English literature in the second half of the seventeenth century which still remains to be written.

Meanwhile, Mr. Thorn Drury has earned the gratitude of all students of English poetry by producing an admirably edited and beautifully produced reprint of "Covent Garden Drollery," one of the most interesting and characteristic of the Restoration miscellanies. This book appeared in 1672, and was reissued "with *Additions*" in the same year. Mr. Thorn Drury prints from the second and enlarged edition. The compiler is called "R.B." on the title-page of the first edition, and "A.B." on that of the second, and is described as "Servant to his Majesty." It has been suggested at different times that the initials represent Richard Brome and Alexander Brome. Mr. Thorn Drury shows in his Introduction that neither could have compiled this collection, as Richard died in 1653 and Alexander in 1666. He makes out a strong case for supposing that

A.B. stands for Aphra Behn, and that the letter R in the first issue is merely an error. Certainly the curious phrase "Servant to his Majesty" fits Mrs. Behn well, as she had been in the service of the government; on the other hand, it might refer to an actor or actress belonging to the King's company of players.

Covent Garden, as Mr. Thorn Drury writes, "suggests a theatrical area," and "Covent Garden Drollery" lives up to its title, for it includes many pieces that are of great interest in connection with stage history. There are numerous prologues and epilogues which should be closely studied in connection with Mr. Thorn Drury's valuable notes by all who are interested in Restoration drama; and there is Joe Haines' delightful poem, *A Lampoon on the Greenwich Stroulers*, which, as far as I know, is the only extant contemporary account of a strolling company of players of the Restoration period, and is also a little masterpiece in a very difficult manner, as fresh and sparkling and humorous as Hogarth's *Strolling Actresses Dressing in a Barn*, which it may well have inspired.

The Song "Farewell, Fair Arminda," the "Answer" to it, and the similar piece "Farewell, dear Revecchia," all appear in this collection, and have long been attributed to Dryden. Mr. Thorn Drury shows in his notes that it is very unlikely that Dryden had anything to do with them. The attribution to Dryden is due to a well-known passage in Act III of *The Rehearsal*, where a song is sung beginning

In swords, Pikes, and Bullets, 'tis safer to be,

which is obviously a parody of "Farewell, Fair Arminda." This song does not occur in the first two editions of *The Rehearsal*, but in the later, enlarged version. Malone and subsequent editors of Dryden have been misled by a note in Briscoe's edition of Buckingham's *Works* (1704) into supposing that the original of the parody was written by Mr. Bayes (i.e. Dryden) on the death of Captain Digby, "who was a passionate Admirer of the Dutchesse Dowager of Richmond," and who was killed in a sea-fight against the Dutch in 1672. This story has been repeated in the only modern annotated edition of *The Rehearsal*, that of Mr. Montague Summers. Mr. Thorn Drury shows conclusively that Briscoe's edition is the only authority for Dryden's supposed authorship of the song, and also for the alleged passion of Captain

Digby for the Duchess, and that the one is about as improbable as the other. Dryden is also relieved from the imputation of having written the foolish doggerel beginning "Farewell, dear *Revecchia*," and Mr. Thorn Drury disposes at the same time of the absurd story that Mrs. Reeves (*Revecchia*) actually performed the part of *Amaryllis* in *The Rehearsal*.

Covent Garden Drollery contains some poems of considerable intrinsic beauty. One jewel which, I believe, has hitherto eluded all anthologists, including even the acute and learned Mr. Ault, is the Song beginning "Phyllis since you and I indeed must sever," to which Mr. Thorn Drury calls attention in his Introduction. Besides its lyrical freshness and charm which the editor justly praises, it seems to me that this Song is also remarkable for its metrical form. The poet is evidently hesitating between the ordinary ten or eleven syllable "iambic" line, and a four-beat accentual measure. He achieves a movement in the former that anticipates that of some of Swinburne's most successful poems, and is far superior to the "anapæstic" jog-trot common enough in ballads and comic songs of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries :

Both by our selves and others tormented,
Still in suspense betwixt Heaven and Hell,
Ever desiring, and never contented,
Either not loving, or loving too well ;
Parting we still are in each other's powers,
Our love's a weather of Sun-shine and Show'rs
Its dayes are bitter, though sweet are its hours.

Comparing the lyrics in this collection with those in earlier miscellanies like "*Parnassus Biceps*," one is struck by the absence of the extravagant conceits which in the first half of the century were considered a necessary ornament of every "paper of verses." The aim of the Restoration lyricist was to be natural and "easy," not to surprise and startle like that of the men of "giant race before the flood." One author, however, has achieved an image which would not have been despised by any "metaphysical" Wit of the reign of Charles I. *Calliope* playing on her lute is compared to Nero harping over burning Rome, for

to her conq'ring eyes
Mankinds a flaming sacrifice !

Mr. Thorn Drury's Introduction and Notes are, as usual, full of valuable criticism and interesting information. The former concludes with two paragraphs on the duties of an editor which are the

most sensible remarks on the subject that the present writer has ever come across, and which should be read, marked, and inwardly digested by all who contemplate the editing of seventeenth-century texts. In view of the principles stated in the first of these paragraphs it must be supposed that the retention of the misprint *Iiffords* for *Giffords* on p. 33 is merely due to a slip in proof-reading.

From what has been said it will be readily understood that no student of Restoration literature can afford to neglect this book. Its beautiful form should also appeal to the collector. If Mr. Thorn Drury cannot give us the complete Dryden which he is better fitted to edit than any living scholar, it is to be hoped that he will continue to edit Restoration miscellanies. The two parts of *Westminster Drollery* contain, perhaps, the finest poetry of them all. They were very inadequately edited by Ebsworth in 1875. A modern edition enriched by Mr. Thorn Drury's brilliant scholarship would make an excellent companion to the present volume.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Shakespeare Improved. The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage. By HAZELTON SPENCER. Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. xiv+406. 23s. net.

THIS work treats very thoroughly of the Shakespeare adaptations which were produced between 1660 and 1710. Following the lines of Dr. Sprague's *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*,* it is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the stage history of the plays and the second with the plays considered separately. In Part I Professor Hazelton Spencer has allowed himself considerable latitude, introducing somewhat discursively much material, not unfamiliar to students, for the purpose of providing an appropriate background. The facts relevant to the production of particular plays are not always easy to trace, even with the aid of the index, and there are no cross-references between Parts I and II. In the second part of the book the plays are classified in three groups under authors' names and two sections comprising miscellaneous adaptations in chronological order. An arrangement based on the nature of the adaptations, if practicable, would have been more useful,

* Reviewed in *R.E.S.*, iii, 370-371.

e.g. those in which only the diction is altered, those in which changes are made in structure as well as in diction, and those treated operatically.

Discussing the reasons for these alterations, Professor Spencer, whilst indicating the influence of neo-classical theory and of the heroic play, the need for simplification and "refinement" of the language, and the political motive, lays greatest stress on the passion for spectacle and the vogue of operatic drama, as being responsible for the most violent manglings. It is to be remarked, however, that of the twenty-three adaptations considered in this work only four have been described as operas. Of these four, *Measure for Measure* exhibits operatic features only in the form of masque-like interludes; while the text of this play, like that of *The Fairy Queen*, is comparatively free from vandalism. Moreover, *The Tempest* had in all probability undergone its main structural changes some years before it was further elaborated into an opera; and, with all deference, the present writer questions whether *Macbeth* had not been similarly treated before it appeared "in the nature of an Opera." In any case, this tragedy was never regarded as a typical opera. Some inconsistency is discernible when Professor Spencer says that *Caius Marius* is "the most absurdly incongruous of all the Restoration versions" (p. 292), and contrasts Otway's reverence for Shakespeare, as expressed in his Prologue, with the attitude of the earlier adapters. It appears that the mangling of *Romeo and Juliet* is to be condoned on the ground that the version is "in fact, less a reworking of Shakespeare's material than a bold appropriation of it for new purposes" (p. 293). Such justification surely applies with greater force to the operatic versions, the significance of which in the history of English opera is ignored in the course of the discussion.

With questions of authorship Professor Spencer does not usually deal at any considerable length. Thus in the case of *Measure for Measure* (Q 1700) he accepts the authority of *Biographia Dramatica*, 1812, where the adaptation is attributed to Gildon. This ascription seems to have been made first in Theophilus Cibber's *The Lives of the Poets*, 1753 (vol. iii, p. 329) apparently on the authority of Coxeter's MS. notes. Again, the conjecture that Settle was responsible for *The Fairy Queen* is mentioned only in a note, without reference to the monograph on that dramatist by F. C. Brown, who was the first to make the suggestion. The present writer is inclined to think that Betterton was the culprit: as in the case of *The*

Prophetess and *Henry IV* (Q 1700), the text is not much tampered with, and Betterton is known to have had considerable experience in setting up operas. Concerning the authorship of *Macbeth* (Q 1674) and of *Hamlet* (Q 1676) Professor Spencer incorporates the evidence which he has set forth elsewhere in favour of D'Avenant. In this connexion he argues, against Professor Nicoll's hypothesis of lost quartos or prompt copies, that the Restoration quartos can almost invariably be traced to definite "pre-Wars" texts; yet it appears from his own notes that in the great majority of cases these sources have not been established beyond dispute. Further research in this field seems to be required before Professor Nicoll's theory can be lightly dismissed.

At the end of the work a summary, rather too brief perhaps, is given of the author's general conclusions. An appendix tabulating the principal facts about each play—dates and places of performance, editions and textual sources, and the nature of the adaptations—would have been very useful for purposes of reference. In other respects it is an admirably produced volume, designed to appeal to the general reader as well as to the specialist student. It is pleasantly written and well printed, adorned with portraits and pictures of theatrical interest, while the notes are relegated to the end of each chapter. Illustrative passages are quoted with scholarly accuracy, though precise reference is not always given and the fastidious critic may object to the occasional disregard of italics and the like. Misprints and inaccuracies are of very rare occurrence; the following may be noted: p. 141, paragraph heading, "Act VI" for "Act IV"; p. 193, first sentence of last paragraph seems faulty; p. 331, last quotation, asterisks should appear after the seventh line, to indicate an omission.

D. M. WALMSLEY.

Sir Charles Sedley, 1639–1701. A Study in the Life and Literature of the Restoration. By V. DE SOLA PINTO, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.). London: Constable & Co., Ltd. 1927. Pp. xii + 400. 21s. net.

THAT excellent work, Chambers's *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, which appeared in 1844 and circulated widely among middle-class families during the nineteenth century, showed in a brief account,

followed by three songs, that even then justice could be done to the sound qualities of the character of Sir Charles Sedley, "as witty and gallant as Rochester, as fine a poet, and a better man," and to his self-redemption and public services; but some actions defy oblivion, and in Sedley's case, the misdemeanours of his younger days have held the field too long without the corrective of a fully documented "Life," not extenuating those scandalous pranks, but placing them in just relation to his whole career.

Such a life has been efficiently provided by his present biographer, who has brought together all that was known, and a great deal hitherto unknown, about the Sedley family, Sir Charles himself, and his interesting daughter Katherine; and in Appendices has supplied much illustrative matter, and a note on the contents of Sir Charles's library. I remark here, being uncertain whether it was unknown to the author or ignored owing to its suspected source, that Collier, in his *An Old Man's Diary*, 1871, part II, p. 86, November 15, 1832, gives a short letter from Sir Charles to "an unknown peer" (deducibly the son of "Lord Hallyfax"), the date of which he says he could not ascertain, merely adding, "It is from a rare autograph." The letter relates to "some small parcell of land" to which Sir Charles lays claim.

In attempting to animate his narrative by picturing the scenes and characters among which Sir Charles moved, the author has given too much scope to conjecture. There does not seem to be anything gained, for instance, by the supposition that Sedley's future wife and her sister were "flighty young women," and further that they perhaps served as models for Olivia and Victoria in *The Mulberry Garden*; or by treating Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* as the result of an actual expedition and conversation. Professor de Sola Pinto is convinced that it was so, notwithstanding that, as Scott noted, Eugenius (Buckhurst) was with the fleet at the time, and sketches the whole concisely on that supposition. He describes the part of *laudator temporis acti* given to Crites as congenial to Sir Robert Howard; but why? Certainly he is by no means alone in treating the *Essay* without effective reference to Howard's address "To the Reader" of his *Four New Plays*, 1665; but Scott, at any rate, noted that that preface condemned the ancients and gave pre-eminence to English plays above theirs and those of all other nations, save as regards the practice of "interweaving mirth and sadness." Whether this neglect of his *written* views offended

Howard or not, he is at pains, in his preface to *The Duke of Lerma*, to disclaim rules and to confute the unities of place and time as plainly as Johnson did later. To a man perhaps more than any one responsible for the spectacular and melodramatic in heroic drama, it might not be altogether pleasing to be given the earlier argument of Crites, while some of his own opinions were put into the mouths of others.

In a work involving so many references as that under consideration, it is inevitable that clerical or press errors and other slips should occur. I have noted a good many of the former, principally in the notes, and a few of the latter, such as making Modish (p. 251) the husband of the mock widow in *The Mulberry Garden*, and a mistaken charge of incorrectness against Pepys in a note on p. 87. Pepys (October 4, 1664) assigns certain lines in Orrery's *Altemira* to Clarimont (Clorimon), not to Lucidor as stated; and his corrector, in describing the situation in the play, is wrong in saying that "Clorimon resolves to obtain a reprieve from the King" for his rival. In fact, Clorimon stops his rival's execution in flat disobedience to the King's orders, and sets him free at once for his greater safety. Some neglect of strict accuracy where there are inferences to be drawn has not led to anything very serious, but impairs confidence. To illustrate from actual life the baiting by the Wits of the inferior coxcombs who clustered round them, "the Dapper-wits, Woodcocks and Tattles, whose aping of the real 'man of parts' provides such frequent subjects for contemporary comedy," the author selects the lampooning of the second Earl of Chesterfield, when the attentions of the Duke of York had caused him to hurry his wife into the country in mid-winter. Now this lampooning was admittedly for the "unforgivable sin" of unconcealed jealousy, taking effect in the strong measures of a man who had lived in Italy, and it had nothing to do with the baiting of foolish ape-wits; but, in citing Hamilton's character of the Earl, Professor de Sola Pinto stops short of the statement: "he was not, however, deficient in wit," which would have at once greatly weakened, if not absolutely negated, his selection. On p. 36, Sedley's mother is inferred from Waller's epitaph upon her to have been a poetess, on the strength of the lines:

The muses daily found supplies
Both from her hands and from her eyes.

with the caveat that this couplet may, however, refer to music. But it is quite obvious from the next two lines of the epitaph (not there

quoted) that what Lady Sedley's hands and eyes respectively supplied were bounty and inspiration to poets :

Her bounty did at once engage
And matchless beauty warm their rage.

Preparative to a second volume which is to contain Sedley's *Works*, the author devotes space to their critical study, and urges Sedley's claim to be classed with Dryden and Etherege as a forerunner of Congreve. In his preliminary sketch of the growth of the English comedy of manners, his practical confinement of Jonson's part to the creation of humours and low comedy ignores the high comedy of the Roman plays and the very important influence of *The Silent Woman*, whose active characters are the fine gentlemen of the comedy of manners, with their usual foils or butts, and whose conversation Dryden commended as the conversation of gentlemen described "with more gaiety, air, and freedom than in the rest of his [Jonson's] comedies." The influence of the play as a model was very great, and I am much mistaken if the betrayal of Modish and Estridge by Wildish in *The Mulberry Garden*, and his refusal to support their excuses, does not owe more than a hint to Clerimont's entrapping of Daw and La-Foole. Congreve, in his *Essay concerning Humour in Comedy*, written to Dennis, besides seconding Dryden's defence of Morose as a character of humour, distinguishes Sir John Daw as a character of affectation. In his dedication of *The Way of the World*, speaking of characters of this latter kind, he refers to hasty judges who did not at once see the difference between a Witwoud and a Truewit, which is significant ; and in the play itself (though this is not a question of manners), the plot depends on the same principles as that of *The Silent Woman*, to wit : (1) that the disinheriting power shall be tricked into a marriage the most obnoxious possible to his or her real wishes ; (2) that the marriage shall be in reality invalid, in order that the threatened heir, who alone holds the proof of this, may be complete master of the situation.

With regard to Sedley, the author's examination of the plays, as of the works generally, is not biased by the partiality natural to a biographer and editor, and does them justice without exaggeration. He points out the merit of the scenes between Olivia and Wildish in *The Mulberry Garden*, which so easily escapes notice in a reading of that clumsy and patchwork play, and the importance of these characters and their dialogues in the growth of the comedy of manners. Though the serious plot of this play, in rhymed verse, deserves his

strictures, and is in every way inferior to that in Etherege's *The Comical Revenge, or Love in a Tub*, I cannot agree that Etherege hints a parody of heroic tragedy in the title of his piece, and deserves credit in that respect. Its rhymed scenes are quite seriously intended, and it was as natural a thing for the one author to take his title from an outstanding comic incident involving a tub, as for the other to take it from the scene of action, the Mulberry Garden.

In dealing with *Bellamira* and giving it on the whole well-deserved praise, the author cites with disapproval a critic of 1902 who called it "coarse and atrocious." To say this and nothing more was very one-sided criticism, but to think these words "singularly inapplicable to such a play" is to err on the other side. The dialogue is frequently "coarse," though Sir Walter Scott was hardly fair when he cited *Bellamira* in defence of *Limberham* for equal coarseness; and as to "atrocious," the epithet was obviously dictated by the conduct of Lionel, which—even if Charles Lamb's defence of Artificial Comedy were as valid as Professor de Sola Pinto thinks—would hardly come under Lamb's protection. In transferring the brutal fact in Terence's *Eumuch* to another age and civilisation and aggravating its guilt, Sedley chose to present and condone a revolting action, and it is difficult to see what loss his play would have suffered if (without going the length of La Fontaine's version) he had modified the story. Let us bear in mind that he had already made the silent Pamphila of Terence speak and interest us as Isabella (a fact which Professor de Sola Pinto does not mention in his account of Sedley's "deviation from Terence's work in the treatment of the female characters"), and had prepared the way for change by making Lionel and her meet previously in Spain. Earlier in the book the author notes that *Bellamira* was not produced without shocking certain ladies, as indicated by Sedley's preface to the Quarto of 1687, and by Shadwell's defence in his dedication to Sedley of *The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal, English and Latin*, published in the same year; but really it is an unfair gloss on Shadwell's words to charge him with implying that a certain amount of obscenity is essential to comedy. To say "that did not their thoughts lye very much that way, they could find no more obscenity in it than in any other Comedy" is quite another thing.

Sedley's songs have not had to wait like his plays for full appreciation, but Professor de Sola Pinto writes with insight of them and the other poems, and of the elements in them which are in strong contrast

with the actions by which the world has judged him. It is, however, perhaps going too far, in speaking of *vers de société*, to call him the founder of the tradition "carried on by Prior, Gay, Locker Lampson and Austin Dobson." Discrimination between the pieces which are really his and "the coarse and inferior pieces" which were fathered on him in eighteenth-century editions is reserved for the forthcoming edition of the *Works*.

R. H. CASE.

Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell. By his Assistants.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 320. 21s. net.

THE Clark Lectures delivered in 1902-3 at Trinity College, Cambridge, by Barrett Wendell are known under the short title, *The Seventeenth Century in English Literature*, to many English students who will appreciate sympathetically the tribute paid to their leader by a strong team of scholars, all of whom have at some time during the thirty years he was at Harvard served under him. The first two essays are impressions of Wendell by the editors. The third, a valuable and well-documented answer by O. J. Campbell to the question "What is Comparative Literature?" is peculiarly appropriate, since it was to the wider aspects of literature that Wendell turned in his later years. Three months before his death in 1921 appeared his *Traditions of European Literature—Homer to Dante*, the sequel to which was to have been *The Six Centuries since Dante*. This forms the title of H. W. L. Dana's essay. It is followed by an important essay on Dante by J. B. Fletcher. H. B. Patch treats a good subject with freshness and marked distinction—*Chaucer and Mediæval Romance*. In view of its references to J. L. Hotson's discoveries, H. W. Herrington's paper on *Christopher Marlowe—Rationalist*, a bold and scholarly piece, is well worth noting. H. B. Lathrop writes *In Praise of Cervantes*. Paul Kaufman has an interesting paper on the history of the conception of original genius; and Lyric poetry is dealt with by H. L. Seaver (*The Asian Lyric and English Literature*) and H. de W. Fuller.

A. W. REED.

The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576-1606). Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press [London: Humphrey Milford]. 1927. Pp. lxi+299. Price \$7.50 (31s. 6d. net).

PROFESSOR ROLLINS, who in 1926 gave us an excellent edition of *The Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, has continued his series of the Elizabethan Miscellanies with the much more interesting *Paradise of Dainty Devices*. This is the first attempt at a variorum edition on modern lines and seems likely to remain the standard for many years. It is provided with a good introduction, a careful collation of the early editions, and very full notes. The contents of the *Paradise* varied considerably in different editions, and it need hardly be said that all the poems which at any time appeared in it are here reprinted.

The Introduction includes a careful description of the early editions, of which Professor Rollins differentiates ten, designating them by the letters *A-I* and *X*, but surely he is in error as to the "undated" one which he calls *G*? While it would be unwise to speak positively without having actually seen the originals, there seems little doubt that the copies which he describes under the letters *F* (1596) and *G* (undated) belong to the same edition, the single copy of *G* having simply been cropped at the foot. To judge from the facsimiles here given, there may even be a trace of the *A* of *Anno* 1596 remaining at the foot of the *G* title, but in any case the setting-up of the two title-pages is clearly identical, while the differences which the editor has found in the texts seem to be no more than we commonly find in different copies of the same edition of books printed about this date. But it is a little difficult to make out what view Professor Rollins takes of the relationship of *F* and *G*. On p. xiv he speaks of the "ten Elizabethan editions of the *Paradise*," but later he tells us that *G* is "merely another impression of the 1596 edition (*F*)."¹ If so, why give it a letter as a separate edition? His remark that "it seems likely that *G* was first printed without a dated title-page, and that, after a few misprints had been detected and corrected, a new title-page dated 1596 was set up and further copies were struck off" is not expressed in a form which will cause modern bibliographers to feel confidence in his knowledge of Elizabethan typographical methods—especially if they have compared the facsimiles of the *F* and *G* titles.

Other sections of the Introduction deal with the Contributors to the *Paradise*, with its Reputation and its Style, the most important of these being the first mentioned. Here taking the signatures of the poems, many of which only bear initials, in alphabetical order, Professor Rollins gives us all the relevant information that is obtainable about each of the known contributors and discusses the identity of those who are uncertain. While he does not seem to have been successful in throwing much new light on the significance of the initials, he has at least collected all available material and preserves an admirably sceptical attitude as to the rather wild attributions of others.

The original black letter of the text is replaced by roman and roman by black-letter, but in the head-lines, titles of poems, initial letters, "finises," and signature-marks, the typography of the original is followed, a method which is, I venture to think, somewhat confusing. Both text, however, and collations seem to be carefully prepared, though the interpretation of some of the latter will probably prove rather puzzling at first sight.

The make-up of the first two sheets of the *Paradise* offers a little biographical problem of some interest. The four preliminary leaves of the edition of 1576, which Professor Rollins regards as the first, are signed A, and consist of title, dedication and, on A3 and A4, four poems. This sheet is followed by a second sheet signed A, the first leaf of which bears the foliation "Fol. 1" and begins with a poem numbered 1. As the poems of the book are numbered consecutively from this onwards, the editor not unnaturally regards the four which occupy the last two pages of the preliminary sheet as an afterthought (p. 180, note on 5. 1). If, however, Professor Rollins' text accurately reproduces the arrangement of the copy-text (and he appears to be careful in this respect), the page is without any general title, dropped head or large-print heading such as is normally placed on the opening page of a text. Save indeed for the running title being all on this page instead of being run across the whole opening, the lay-out of the page is exactly the same as that of later pages of the book. We cannot suppose that the page had at one time a normal heading and that the actual A1 is a cancel, for the poems occupy the whole leaf; nor can we suppose that a poem was added to fill it up, for this would have disturbed the numbering. Alternatively, if we imagine that there was an earlier edition which had a regular heading as A1, and that this heading

was suppressed in 1576 in order that the book should run on without a break, we are faced by the difficulty that the edition of 1576 cannot have been a page-for-page reprint, and if it were not it would have been quite unusual for the printer to begin with two gatherings signed A. I confess that I cannot see how the arrangement is to be satisfactorily accounted for.

The notes are full and excellent. Professor Rollins has perhaps given an unnecessary amount of space to the illustration of common proverbial phrases and the like, though as he has indexed most of these under "proverbs" his work will at least be a valuable quarry for other editors. It is much to be wished that some one—and none could do it better than the editor of the work under discussion—would give us once for all a comprehensive work on Elizabethan proverbs and proverbial locutions, and thus obviate the necessity of every editor giving his own set of laboriously garnered parallels.

R. B. MCK.

**The Pack of Autolycus or Strange and Terrible News
... as told in Broadside Ballads of the Years 1624-
1693.** Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Cambridge:
Harvard University Press [London: Humphrey Milford].
1927. Pp. xvii+270. Price \$5.00 (21s. net).

PROFESSOR HYDER E. ROLLINS has followed up his *Pepysian Garland* by a reprint of forty ballads selected from collections at the Bodleian, the Pepysian collection, the Euing collection in the University Library, Glasgow, and a collection in the Manchester Reference Library. Almost all are of the nature of news-ballads, telling of murders, monstrous births, apparitions, earthquakes, fires and the like. They are literally reprinted from the originals and are furnished with full and useful annotations, and most of the woodcuts of the originals are given (in some cases apparently reduced). The editorial work seems to be excellent, but of the ballads themselves it is difficult to find anything good to say. They are not indeed worse than others of their kind, but is there anything more contemptible as literature than the average "black-letter" ballad? This does not of course mean that they may not be of great historical importance, for they often preserve details of events which the serious historians thought unworthy of notice and which may serve to explain cryptic allusions

in works of much greater importance. It is for this reason most desirable that all extant ballads should be carefully listed and their whereabouts made known, but I would suggest that we do not really need full reprints but rather an annotated catalogue giving a summary of the incidents recorded and of course noting every name mentioned, whether of the actors in the events described or of the witnesses. Such summaries, properly indexed, would be of the highest value and would of course occupy only a small fraction of the space needed for full reprints; and there is no one better fitted to perform the task than Professor Rollins.

The ballads in this collection are arranged in what, I presume, Professor Rollins regards as the date of printing of the edition used, but in one case at least, the first, it may be suggested that the print is later than the date assigned to it (1624). The printer's name is given as R.E., but the earliest printer known with these initials was one, Robert Eles, a "common printer and seller of unlicensed books" in 1646. I wish that the editor had explained a little more fully the allusions to the height of the steeple of St. Paul's in the ballad entitled "The Jew's high commendation of St. Pauls," which is dated about 1660. Surely the steeple was burnt down in 1561 and was never rebuilt. Readers will find here a few ballads which are known to them by titles and which they will be glad to see at length. Thus the ballad of *The Devil's Conquest* is probably known to many from the extraordinary 300-word title printed in Hazlitt's *Handbook*, p. 156, which narrates how in consequence of theft and for swearing the heroine, one Margery Perry, had an encounter with the devil of which she afterwards died in extreme agony, "and her body was found as black as pitch all over, and all this was for no more than the value of eleven pence, which was done on the 6th of this instant May, 1665, and was written for a warning to all, to avoid the like course. The Tune is *Summer Time*." I was also interested to read the story of the lady who accidentally swallowed an adder, with the result that she produced fourteen young adders "By Vomit and the Lords command." It was almost superfluous in the writer to add that "no other wight could do the same."

R. B. McK.

A Census of the Manuscripts of Oliver Goldsmith. By KATHARINE CANBY BALDERSTON. E. Byrne Hackett, New York; Oxford University Press, London. 1926. Pp. xii+73. 21s. net.

EVERY editor who knows his business endeavours to trace the manuscripts, letters, and other autographs of the author with whom he is concerned; but not every editor gives to the world, in advance of his main work, the results of his research. This is, in short, what Miss Balderston has done: there can be no doubt that her example is worthy of emulation. Miss Balderston has met with a fair measure of success in running her quarry to earth; the list of lost manuscripts, *i.e.* those not seen since Prior wrote his *Life of Goldsmith*, is, however, long. Owners of manuscripts have been helpful, but the legend "not available for examination" tells its own tale.

The book itself is charmingly produced and accurately printed; twenty-one shillings is, indeed, as Charles Lamb would have said, a broad shot for so slim a volume; we might, perhaps, have been given for that sum blank interleaves on which to enter additions, corrections, and changes of ownership. Miss Balderston has herself made some eleventh-hour additions and it is possible that more will follow; I have noted a few places where some correction is needed. Page 21, Goldsmith's letter to Mrs. Thrale was published by A. M. Broadley in his *Dr. Johnson and Mrs. Thrale*. Page 25, the date of the lost letter to John Nourse is here given as *c.* February 20, 1774, but on pp. 55-6 as *c.* February 4, 1773. Page 32, Newbery's Accounts are extremely involved and Miss Balderston has threaded her way through their mazes with great skill, but I find no record in her book of Goldsmith's promissory note, dated July 7, 1767, for £10. Pages 54-5, the manuscript of Kate Hardcastle's song in *She stoops to conquer*, which Boswell preserved "with an affectionate care," was doubtless among the documents recently disposed of by Lord Talbot de Malahide. Minor corrections and additions are: page 14, "H. W. Singer" for "a Mr. Singer," and, page 29, "William Nicol" for "a Mr. Nicol"; page 20 and Index, "Boaden" for "Boadley"; page 57, Malone's Christian name was "Edmond," not "Edmund" (the *D.N.B.* is perhaps responsible for this error).

A long-suffering librarian may be forgiven for complaining of the

inaccuracy of writers and editors in the matter of titles. Miss Balderston knows only too well that the edition of Goldsmith containing the Percy Memoir was not entitled *Collected Works* (p. 2), and her reference to her own excellent work, *The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith*, as *Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith* is likely to cause confusion in years to come.

Professor C. B. Tinker, who, clearly, would have made battle against Boswell's representation of Goldsmith in the *Life of Johnson*, as Malone did, introduces the book very pleasantly.

L. F. POWELL.

P.S.—Since the above was written the autograph manuscript of Goldsmith's translation of Vida has been discovered in the Rimington-Wilson collection of books on chess. According to the sale catalogue (Messrs. Sotheby & Co.) of this collection the manuscript was acquired by Mr. J. W. Rimington-Wilson on Bolton Corney's death in 1870.

L. F. P.

Endymion, a Poetic Romance. By JOHN KEATS. Type-facsimile of the First Edition, with Introduction and Notes by H. CLEMENT NOTCUTT. Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1927. Pp. lxi+242. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS book falls into two parts, a careful type-facsimile of the first edition of *Endymion*, and a laborious commentary on the meaning of the poem by Professor Notcutt. The facsimile of the text, admirably executed by the Oxford Press, will be a joy to all students and lovers of Keats. The chief fault to find with the book as a substitute for its original is that, while it should be slim and light—alas! it is fat and heavy. Professor Notcutt's pages, wisely printed on paper of a different colour and quality, will bring no joy to student or lover. They offer an industrious and elaborate exposition of the meaning of the poem, which is summarised thus:

In Book I the festival of Pan symbolises the revival of interest in the beauty and the mysterious power of Nature, which had marked the beginning of a new poetic era. The repeated appearances of the moon goddess to Endymion represent the awakening of the man who is destined to be a poet to the beauty of the ideal which he must strive to attain.

Book II, in the story of Endymion's journey underground, gives us a picture of the course of preparation—chiefly through the study of the great

writers of earlier times—by which the young poet may fit himself for his task. . . .

Book III contains a warning. Under the guise of the disastrous experience of Glaucus it tells how in an earlier time English poetry had been led astray by a powerful but evil influence, of which Pope stands as the chief representative; and how, after a long period of impotence and decrepitude, it was restored to fresh life and vigour by the redeeming power of the spirit of the new era.

Book IV tells how the poet, still in pursuit of his ideal, is perplexed by the call of humanity in trouble, and is torn between the desire to devote himself to the service of his suffering fellow-creatures and the other desire to reach the ideal after which he has so long been striving; until at length the conflict and perplexity vanish when he sees that for him the two ideals are but one, for he can best serve his fellow-men by entering fully into the poetic life.

Professor Notcutt presses every detail of the story into the service of this arbitrary reading. Circe is Pope, who enslaved English poetry with bewitching arts; the elephant, in himself a little ridiculous, is discovered to be Colley Cibber. Glaucus is the genius of English poetry in the eighteenth century, and the scroll he snatched from the dead man's hand is the ballad MS. of the *Reliques*, "barely saved from destruction by Bishop Percy."

There is no scrap of evidence that Keats meant any of these things. Why should we suppose he did? Because if not, Professor Notcutt thinks, the greater part of *Endymion* is "fantastic imagery about nothing in particular." Only grant the allegorical meaning and we have "significant truth instead of pointless nonsense." These are strange words from a critic of poetry. Circe is the eternal enchantress who turns men into beasts. Is that pointless nonsense? Is it not truth enough? Do we reach significant truth only when we see her as Alexander Pope? Must poetic imagery be about anything? Need poetry mean anything but itself? Ought we to ask more of a "Poetic Romance" than that it be both romance and poetry? We only ask more if the poet means more. That Keats meant more is certainly true. All his best critics have known this. Mrs. Owen, Sidney Colvin, Robert Bridges, Professor de Selincourt, have each said in different words that *Endymion* is the poet's soul seeking through painful experience its union with the ideal. Keats has told us as much in the poem itself and in his letters. For what symbolism there is in *Endymion* we need not go beyond the suggestion of his own words.

The introductions to the four books point the way down the main

avenues of his thought. The first book opens with the first article of his creed :

A thing of beauty is a joy for ever ;

and there follows a golden list of things of beauty,—the sun, the moon, trees, daffodils ; the fate of mighty souls, all lovely human tales ; the passion poesy. Nature first, then humanity, then poetry. The idea of beauty rounds in all three. We come to recognise the triple-branched design. Book II invokes humanity in the form of human love ; Book III invokes Nature under the symbol of the moon ; Book IV invokes poetry. In a passage of the first book (lines 777-849) upon which Keats set much store—he calls it “ a regular stepping-stone of the imagination towards the truth ”—Endymion makes his most philosophical attempt to solve the problem of his life. He sees three stages by which the mind advances to “ fellowship divine,” or “ fellowship with essence ” ; first, sensuous communion with Nature, then human love and friendship, lastly divine or ideal love. Endymion loved the moon, for in the moon all the loveliness of Nature seemed incarnate ; he loved a human being, and in her loved the beauty of sensitive suffering humanity ; and he loved a goddess, only because her divine beauty drew his soul like a loadstone. He suffered and struggled till he saw these three loves as one. “ I have a triple soul,” he cries. He had to learn that he had one soul, and that beauty is truth ; the ideal, real ; reality, divine.

But rather than press too hard the inner meaning of a beautiful rambling romance, we may leave Keats to speak for himself :

I am certain of nothing but of the holiness of the heart's affections and the truth of the Imagination. What the Imagination seizes as beauty must be truth—whether it existed before or not—for I have the same idea of all our passions as of Love ; they are all in their sublime creative of essential Beauty. In a word, you know my favourite speculation by my first Book [*i.e.* *Endymion* Book I]. . . . The Imagination may be compared to Adam's dream—he awoke and found it truth [Letter to Bailey, November 22, 1817].

Much harm is done to the study of literature by well-meaning critics who deposit loads of unsifted learning on a favourite poet, or think to illumine his depths by laboured exposition. The brightness of true poetry cannot indeed be dulled, and its lovers will not be cheated of the gleam. But an honest student's vision may be seriously injured by his effort to read a poet through the wrong spectacles. These should not be put in his way.

HELEN DARBISHIRE.

Nine Essays. By ARTHUR PLATT. With a preface by A. E. Housman. Cambridge University Press. 1927. Pp. xviii+220, 8s. 6d.

YOUNG students who band themselves into a Literary Society not unnaturally expect the papers read to them to be set in a lighter key than that which dominates the official lectures which they are bound to attend. Perhaps not many compositions read to such societies are worth printing; perhaps of the more successful ones some are sternly suppressed by their writers, whether for shame at their concessions, or for fear lest more demands should be made on their leisure. But in their own small way such papers form a little class by themselves, and the class could hardly be better represented than by the seven of the *Nine Essays* here printed which were wrung from Professor Platt by the importunity of the Literary Society of University College, London, where he was Professor of Greek for thirty years. They are really masterly examples of how fine scholarship can be salted with wit and humour to make it acceptable to undergraduates "after hours," and yet convey quite clearly and steadfastly its own message. Arthur Platt's scholarship was undeniable and the range of it impressive. It covered literature in eight languages, and the men about whom he talked to his undergraduates were Edward Fitzgerald, Aristophanes, La Rochefoucauld, Lucian, Cervantes and the Emperor Julian! More than this, there is an undertone of science constantly making itself heard in these literary talks, and this (not unaided by frequent references to cricket) discloses Platt as not only having a love for Greek language and literature, but being, among literary professors, unusually Greek in his outlook. The seventh of these talks is on the Relations of Poetry and Science, and though there are some phrases in it which Platt would hardly have allowed to stand if he had seen them in print, it shows him at his best. The two other papers in the volume are an address on "Science and Arts among the Ancients" given at the opening of session of the Faculty of Arts and Science in University College in 1899, and the masterly Prelection on Plato, *Phædo*, Chaps. 45-48, which Platt read when he was persuaded, although already over sixty, to stand for the Professorship of Greek at Cambridge in 1921. This is a really fine elucidation of an argument the meaning of which had been missed by the commentators for lack of connecting it with the brief survey of Greek philosophy

in the beginning of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and it is charming to find that, despite the subject and the occasion, Platt did not fail to talk cricket to the electors and even hinted at the probability that some of them would not have been able to follow his argument. The easy humour of the papers for the Literary Society at University College may have been a little heightened and coloured to please his undergraduate audience, but Platt could not suppress it even in a Prelection, and he does not seem to have tried. It is natural that Professor Housman in his affectionate preface to these essays should write: "This record will not preserve, perhaps none could preserve, more than an indistinct and lifeless image of the friend who is lost to us"; but I am sure that this book will live and that at whatever date it is read its readers will feel that they are receiving a most lively conception of so much of himself as Platt cared to show to his students, and thanks to Professor Housman, at least a far from lifeless suggestion of what he was to his more intimate friends.

A. W. P.

The Post-War Mind of Germany and other European Studies. By Professor C. H. HERFORD. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1927. Pp. 248. 10s.

THE six essays collected in the present volume are all concerned either with the literature and thought of foreign countries or with the interactions between the poetry of England on the one hand and the life and poetry of Germany, France, Russia and Italy on the other—with, in the author's own words, international affinities and relations.

The physical and mental suffering of the Germans in the five years immediately following the Armistice was more acute than during the four years of the actual war, and the period was, in fact, to some extent, a continuation of the war against a disarmed people. In his first essay on the mind of post-war Germany Professor Herford combines sympathy for the agony of the nation with a penetrating understanding of the difficulties which were encountered, both inside and outside the country, by the better minds in their efforts to rebuild German civilisation on the ruins of the past. He studies not only the literature of the Expressionist generation but also the roots of that ineradicable German idealism which found utterance in such varying forms as the Youth Movement, Count Keyserling's School of Wisdom, and the practical yet comprehensive

philosophy and understanding faith of the statesman-industrialist Walther Rathenau. This lengthy essay will remain an indispensable source for the comprehension of the spiritual ferment in which a lost war and a revolution involved a nation whose idealism is all the more vague since it is rooted so deeply in the emotions.

The essay on the culture of Bolshevik Russia is imbued with an equal sympathy for a political transformation which is, perhaps, pregnant with even greater meaning for the future of Europe and the world. The author emphasises the fact that a simple condemnation of the Bolshevik state is futile, not only because of its vastness and complexity, but because it is fundamentally *new*. Neither must we blink at facts and try to find a compromise in our practical attitude to the experiment, but we must face the truth and realise that a novel contribution is being made to civilisation. A country covering one-seventh of the land surface of the globe and occupied by "about sixty distinct peoples in every stage of civilisation and barbarism," which the government is trying to build up into a unified and cultured state, cannot be dismissed with a contemptuous, if fear-inspired epithet, and though we can understand the desire of the proprietors of the popular press to simplify foreign politics for their readers, the policy of Soviet Russia is not adequately explained by qualifying it with the adjective "red." Without being blind to the defects and reactionary elements in this policy, Professor Herford discusses the constructive aspect of the new cultural activities in Russia, and his final conclusion is that the temper which is being engendered "has at least a glimpse of the social basis upon which Plato and Sir Thomas More long ago laid down that true education must be built."

Two essays deal with Shakespeare on the Continent. The first is of a general nature and traces the development of his influence in Germany, France and Russia; the second is of more limited scope and discusses the English poet as a factor in the mental life of Pushkin. The contributions of Professor J. G. Robertson to this subject are already well known, and these essays should be read in conjunction with them. They are too packed with matter and suggestion for even the shortest synopsis to be practicable in this review, but it is sufficient to say that no student of Shakespeare, however insular, can afford to disregard their stimulus.

The essay on Dante and Milton is a study of relations, for, as the author explains, there can hardly be a question here of influence. It is an acute analysis of the divergences and points of contact between

the minds of the creators of two great poems of Heaven and Hell. The political background of Dante's Italy and Milton's England, together with the difference in outlook produced by three intervening centuries, is carefully considered, and the permanent qualities of mind and temper which give the two poets their place in the evolution of the consciousness of humanity are elucidated with a fullness of reference to their works which bears witness to Professor Herford's deep thinking and psychological insight.

The final essay is entitled *National and International Ideals in the English Poets*. It points out the difference between the patriotism of a primitive tribe defending its hearth and that of a twentieth-century Englishman in whose heart are drawn together the many complex emotions and traditions which root him to his native land. It then investigates the part of the English poets in relation to the three types of national ideal—primitive patriotism, the nationalism which seeks internal cohesion and unity, and the larger vision which envisages an internationalism that embraces and completes the narrower idealism. Poetry has room for all of these, but it is to the latter that Professor Herford devotes most of his space. The brief sketch of the echoes which the aspirations and struggles for liberty of other nations found in the poetry of England in the nineteenth century would, if expanded into a separate book, form a valuable contribution to the history of English poetic inspiration.

When, in the dim future, the crying need for Chairs of comparative literature in the universities of this country is fulfilled, it is to books such as this that students will look for inspiration and guidance as to the lines along which the comparative study of literature should be pursued.

WILLIAM ROSE.

A New English Dictionary. WISE-WYZEN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 20s. net.

Catalogue of an Exhibition held in the Bodleian Library to celebrate the completion of the Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6d. net.

THIS section of the Dictionary contains many words of great etymological interest. The most important are words of Old English origin, many of them in very common use, with a long history to be

illustrated ; examples will be found in the articles on *woman*, *wood*, *word*, *work* (noun and verb), *world* and *write*, while the preposition *with* and its compounds occupy about fifteen pages. Scandinavian words are not very common, but include the important word *wrong*, an early borrowing. *Wreck* is also of Scandinavian origin but apparently borrowed through Anglo-French. There are several Low German loan words, especially in the Wr- group : *wrangle* and *wriggle* are the chief ones in common use ; the early history of several of these words is obscure. Words of Romance origin are naturally very scarce, the most important is *wyvern*, a beast almost as strange in its phonology as in its anatomy. Some etymological puzzles are *withers* (of a horse), *woo*, *wraith* and *wrap*. Formations on earlier stems are made in all periods ; Dryden invented the word *witticism*, Carlyle furnishes the first quotation for *wreckage*. It is odd that, though the compound *workman* is illustrated from King Alfred's translation of Boethius, no example of *working-man* is given earlier than the year 1816.

As this section completes the Dictionary, it is fitting that we should express our thanks to those who have contributed to give us this great work. In 1857, after hearing two papers by Dean (afterwards Archbishop) Trench on the deficiencies of existing dictionaries, the Philological Society appointed a committee to collect material for a supplement. It soon became clear that the proposed supplement would be out of scale with its predecessors, and plans for a new dictionary were discussed and Herbert Coleridge was appointed as editor in 1859. On his death in 1861 he was succeeded by Dr. Furnivall, who recognised that the early history of large numbers of words could not be satisfactorily dealt with owing to the inaccessibility of most of the earlier literature, and founded the Early English Text Society in 1864 to provide material for the dictionary.

After approaching several publishers the Philological Society entered into negotiations with the Oxford University Press, and an agreement was signed in 1879. In this year the Council of the Society issued a statement in which it took a very optimistic view of the progress of the work. This statement also says that Mr. (afterwards Sir) James Murray had partially given up his work as a master at Mill Hill School in order to edit the dictionary. The first part, A—Ant, was published in February 1884, and a review of it by Henry Bradley (recently reprinted in the memorial volume of his writings) led to his being invited to co-operate.

In 1885 Murray moved to Oxford, where he gave his whole time to the dictionary until his death thirty-three years later. Bradley, after working for some time in London, undertook the editing of E and went to Oxford in 1896. Dr. (now Sir) W. A. Craigie joined the Oxford staff in 1897, and the first part edited by him was the letter N in Vol. VI. Towards the cost of this volume the Goldsmiths' Company contributed £5,000. In 1914, after ten years' work with Murray and Bradley, Mr. Onions began independent editing of the section Su-Sz. Nor must we forget the editors' assistants at Oxford or the hundreds of readers who provided the material, not only in this country but also in the United States, where the work was organised by Professor F. A. Marsh of Lafayette College, Penn., while in Holland Dr. Caland gave valuable help.

We have spoken of the completion of the dictionary, but such a work can never be complete. It is over forty years since the first part was published, and in that time the language has grown and new light has been thrown on its history. A supplement is in preparation, and the Clarendon Press generously offers a copy of it free to all possessors of the complete dictionary.

To celebrate the completion of the work an exhibition was arranged in the Bodleian Library to illustrate the history of English lexicography from interlinear glosses in Latin texts to the New English Dictionary. The catalogue contains fifty-four items, and Dr. Onions contributes an illuminating foreword.

A. C. WOOD.

A Syntax of Living English. By A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VETH.
Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon. 1928. Pp. vi+330. F. 4.90.

THERE is much in this book that is of real value to students of English grammar, this lies chiefly in the explanation of the grammar and meaning of individual examples, and in the way that the nature of the grammatical formulæ is made clear by reference to a speaker's thought or to the effect produced in the mind of a listener. Of particular interest are the sections on the relations between adjective and noun, on comparison and on aspect.

It is unfortunate that this interesting grammar is somewhat unequal; a good deal of it is excellent (§ 7, for instance, which deals with the Subject and its position), but there are many sections which

set out the formal usage only, and so lack completeness ; those few parts that appear vague or which contain inaccuracies do not seem to have received the same careful thought that has obviously been expended on the best sections ; nevertheless any deficiencies are outweighed by the soundness, lucidity and conciseness of the major portion.

One wonders how long the writers of school grammar books in England will continue to ignore the good work that is being done on our language outside this island.

P. GURREY.

An English Grammar for Dutch Students. By E. KRUISINGA. Vol. I. A Shorter Accidence and Syntax (4th Edition). Utrecht : Kemink & Zoon. 1928. Pp. xv+230. F. 3.50.

THOUGH this book was written for Dutch students it would be useful to those who are learning Dutch or who are working at comparative grammar, and is not without interest to those studying their own language.

Throughout Dr. Kruisinga has explained and illustrated the accepted formal usage of a word or phrase, *e.g.* "43. In compounds or word-groups the genitive ending is always added to the last part : *My father-in-law's* house ; . . ." This method of handling the language produces clearness and economy, but one wishes that he had more frequently referred the usage of a word or phrase to the meaning by showing what thought the writer wished to convey in the sentence by the use of a particular form, phrase or word order ; this would have ensured greater exactness of thought and completeness of understanding.

One must not omit to draw attention to the presentation of Tense, and of Modality : still more instructive are the sections on Comparison, which deal amongst other things with the Comparative of Superiority, of Proportion and of Graduation ; here the usage is explained and the forms labelled on a thought basis.

P. GURREY.

Essays and Studies. By members of the English Association.
Vol. XIII, collected by CAROLINE SPURGEON. 7s. 6d. 8vo.
Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

THE current number of *Essays and Studies* falls conveniently into a chronological series, ranging from Anglo-Saxon literature to contemporary English. Miss Philpotts, discussing "Wyrd and Providence in Anglo-Saxon thought," offers suggestive ideas on an old problem, the Christian element in Anglo-Saxon poetry. Her essay serves as a valuable companion to that of Mr. Routh in vol. xi of this series. Miss Waddell's lively study of John of Salisbury, though biographical rather than critical, creates an important precedent as the first of *Essays and Studies* definitely relating to mediæval English Humanism. Professor Manly considers *Sir Thopas* in its dual aspect of burlesque on romance and satire upon the contemporary Fleming new rich, without, however, accepting Miss Winstanley's identification of Chaucer's original with Philip van Artevelde. Shakespearian scholars and students will be grateful to M. Legouis for his sound and impartial estimate of recent Shakespearian criticism, especially that of Schücking and Stoll, and most readers will endorse his plea for moderation in respect to modern as distinct from romantic methods. In an essay, based upon an address to the Edinburgh Sir Walter Scott Club, Professor Grierson accounts for Carlyle's failure fully to appreciate Scott, and in refutation of the most famous passage in Carlyle's essay he draws an instructive parallel between Scott's art of characterisation and that of Shakespeare. A concluding remark contains the whole gist of the matter. "Are all Carlyle's effusions over the Eternal Verities more 'doctrinal to a nation' or individual than the sober words in which Scott justifies himself for not assigning to Rebecca in *Ivanhoe* a happier fate?" Miss Marjory A. Bald writes on "Shelley's mental progress," a subject to which it is difficult to do justice within the limits of a short essay. Lord Dunsany, in an amusing survey of English language conditions, calls attention to current abuses of speech and the dangers of a widening breach between the colloquial and the literary languages.

BERNARD E. C. DAVIS.

Suffixvokal nach kurzer Tonsilbe vor r, n, m im Angelsächsischen. Von GEORG WEBER. Leipzig: Mayer & Müller. 1927. Pp. xv. + 143. M.10.

SUFFIXABLAUT before resonant consonants in Anglo-Saxon has been treated by H. Weyhe in *P.B.B.* 30, 84-131, with regard to *l* only. This work completes the investigation, which is carried down to A.D. 1000, by adding *r, n, m*. The author's aim is, in especial, twofold: to establish the disappearance of the old suffix-vowels and the emergence of new ones; by means of such criteria to attain to a better dating of the monuments examined. Thus his subdivisions are "Sprossvokal und Synkope vor *r* (p. 3), *n* (p. 47), *m* (p. 98)"; and the history of such medial syllables (p. 109). The investigation is carried out with admirable thoroughness, each item being divided into "Before Alfred" and "After Alfred." The usefulness of the Index of Words is seriously hampered by its incompleteness.

A. J. W.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

The British Museum Quarterly. London: published by [Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, for] the Trustees. [Vol. I], No. 4; Vol. II, Nos. 1 and 2. Price 2s. each.

In the first of these three numbers the principal accession described which falls within our province is a first edition of *Tristram Shandy*, 9 vols. 1760-7. Among the seventeenth and eighteenth century books recently acquired (pp. 99-100) are several scarce volumes which were needed to fill gaps in the collection, but beyond a couple of rare Dryden and Defoe items nothing of first-rate literary importance. The second number contains little of special interest to us, but the third announces the important acquisition of the very rare first edition of Smart's *Song to David*, 1763; this is one of four known copies and has the distinction of being signed by the author. While, however, these three numbers of the quarterly contain comparatively little which makes its chief appeal to students of English Literature, there is much which will be of interest to all who concern themselves with art or antiquities, while the sixteen to eighteen pages of excellent half-tone illustrations which each number contains will alone be to many readers worth the very moderate price. We hope, by the way, that it is intended to print an index. It might be convenient if this, and a binding-case, were provided for two volumes together. They would not make an inconveniently thick book.

The Variant Issues of Shakespeare's Second Folio and Milton's First Published English Poem. A Bibliographical Problem. By ROBERT METCALF SMITH. (Lehigh University Publication, Vol. II, No. 3, March 1928.) Lehigh University. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Pp. 62. Price 25 cents.

A most careful and exhaustive study of the curious bibliographical problem of the variations in the two (conjugate) preliminary leaves of the Second Folio which contain the title and Milton's verses. Professor R. M. Smith distinguishes five variants of the title bearing the name of Allot as publisher, and three of the verses, and shows how these are associated. Facsimiles are included of all these as well as of the four titles which give the names of other booksellers who shared in the publication of the book. It would be out of place here to discuss the matter from a bibliographical point of view, but it may be said that the investigation seems finally to dispose of the claim of "starre-yointed Pyramid," which appears in one of the variant forms of the verses, to be the correct reading, and confirms the authenticity of the traditional "starre-yointing."

A History of Restoration Drama, 1660-1700. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Second Edition. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1928. Pp. x+410. 16s. net.

This second edition of Professor Allardyce Nicoll's well-known work, first issued in 1923, has been revised and corrected throughout, in order to bring the survey up to date, and contains a valuable appendix of additional notes on individual points upon which the researches of the last four years have brought new facts to light. It is, perhaps, a pity that references could not have been inserted to these notes, some of which modify considerably what is stated in the text. This has, indeed, been done in one or two cases of especial importance, but in the great majority the student is left to discover them for himself, with the result that they may easily be overlooked.

The Lives of John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert and Robert Sanderson. By IZAAK WALTON. With an Introduction by George Saintsbury. (The World's Classics, No. 303.) 1927. London: Oxford University Press. 2s. net.

This volume is a most welcome addition to a very useful series. Professor Saintsbury's short and sympathetic Introduction to the *Lives* is as "refreshing to read" as Walton himself.

Five Restoration Tragedies. Edited with an Introduction by BONAMY DOBRÉE. (The World's Classics, No. 313.) 1927. London: Oxford University Press. 2s. net.

The volume contains *All for Love*, *Venice Preserv'd*, *Oroonoko*, *The Fair Penitent*, and Addison's *Cato*. Although it contains no specimen of the drama written in rhymed couplets, the selection may be said to justify the claim made in Mr. Dobrée's Introduction that "the plays here printed give a very fair, and by no means uninteresting, chilly, or unamusing view of the tragedy of the Restoration." Dryden's masterpiece is, however, probably the only play in the collection to which the reader can turn with the satisfied recognition of work thoroughly good in its kind. Mr. Dobrée holds out hopes of a further volume in the series to be devoted to tragedy written in heroic couplets.

A Miscellany of Tracts and Pamphlets, XVI-XX Centuries. (The World's Classics, No. 304.) 1927. London: Oxford University Press. 2s. net.

An interesting selection, including among some well-known pieces a few less familiar writings such as *Fragmenta Regalia* (observations on Elizabeth's favourites), by Sir Robert Naunton, and Colonel Sexby's tract entitled *Killing No Murder*, which was aimed against Cromwell after the establishment of the Protectorate, and which, after being printed in Holland, was brought secretly to England, and sold by the author in disguise.

Selected Poems. By WILLIAM BLAKE. With an Introduction by Basil de Sélincourt. (The World's Classics, No. 324.) 1927. London: Oxford University Press. 2s. net.

This very all-round selection includes *Songs of Innocence and Experience*, poems from *Poetical Sketches*, from the Rossetti and Pickering MSS., and from Blake's letters, etc.; a large section of the volume is given to extracts from the prophetic books, and there are also a few passages of prose from Blake's *Descriptive Catalogue*, and from letters. Mr. de Sélincourt's Introduction, a brief and penetrating study of the poet's powers and limitations as artist and thinker, contains some illuminative phrases, such as his reference to the inherent weakness within Blake's "displays of spiritual muscularity," and his remark that this poet "does not care to live anywhere but in Heaven."

An Introduction to the Reading of Shakespeare. By FREDERICK S. BOAS. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1927. Pp. 112. 2s. 6d. net.

This excellent little book, which was first issued in 1921, has now been included in revised and enlarged form, in "The World's Manuals," where it will, no doubt, reach a still wider public. It would be difficult to imagine an introduction to Shakespeare for the general reader which would better serve to help him over the initial difficulties of the subject and be more likely to give him an enduring interest in it. Particularly good is the chapter on "Shakespeare's Language," which in a few pages brings together a most interesting collection of examples to illustrate the points which may be missed by a reader without an elementary knowledge of the changes which have taken place in our tongue since Shakespeare's time. As the purpose of the book is solely to aid in the appreciation and enjoyment of Shakespeare, Dr. Boas was doubtless wise to say little or nothing of the many problems in connection with his writings which have exercised the ingenuity of generations of students, but one cannot help regretting the very interesting chapter in which some of these might have been briefly dealt with. And, though it seems heretical even to mention it, the average reader has heard of the Baconian theory and even in a little book like this will probably expect to find some mention of it, if only a paragraph of ridicule. There are some good illustrations, although one may be permitted to doubt whether, when the possible choice of material was so wide, it was necessary to include portraits of Ibsen and Shaw.

The Northanger Novels. A Footnote to Jane Austen. By MICHAEL SADLEIR. (The English Association, Pamphlet No. 68, November 1927.) Pp. 32. 2s. 6d. net [from the Oxford University Press, E.C.]. Obtainable by Members of the English Association from the Secretary at 1s. net.

An interesting account of the seven "Gothic" romances which Isabella Thorpe and Catherine Morland were to read together in *Northanger Abbey*. Mr. Sadleir has succeeded in finding all seven, and their title-pages are reproduced at the end of his paper.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LII. (Neue Folge XL.), June 1928—

Textual Notes on the Chester Old Testament Plays (P. E. Dustoor), pp. 97-112.

Chaucers Book of the Leoun (V. Langhans), pp. 113-22.

Neue Wege zur Lösung der Lengendenprologfrage bei Chaucer (H. Lange), pp. 123-35.

I. Die Verherrlichung der Königin Anna im F-Prolog; Nachtrag zu der Stelle F 504: *she kytheth what she is*.

Die Stellung Rose Macaulays zur Frau (M. Kluge), pp. 136-73.

Shakespeare Notes (A. H. Krappe), pp. 174-82.

The Source of *King Richard III.*, 1. i. 1-4? *Macbeth*, v. i. and v. v. 23-28; *Hamlet*, 1. iii. 58-69.

Weitere Beiträge zur altenglischen Wortforschung (Otto B. Schlutter), pp. 183-91.

London Slang (E. Einenkel), p. 192.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 12, July 1928—

The Art of Jane Austen (S. Alexander), pp. 314-35.

Comparison with Molière.

John Bunyan and the Higher Criticism (J. Rendel Harris), pp. 347-62.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, June 1928—

Thought and Brain: A Guess by Shakespeare (D. Fraser-Harris), pp. 671-77.

Shakespeare's medical knowledge and intuition.

— July —

Pen Portraits in Jane Austen's Novels (John H. Hubback), pp. 24-33.

— August —

Business in Fiction (Wm. Alexander), pp. 176-85.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 62, May 1928—

Beowulf und nordische Dämonenaustreibung (Gustav Hübener), pp. 293-327.

Leben und Lernen in England im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert (Schluss) (Margarete Rösler), pp. 328-82.

Shaviana (A. Schröer), pp. 383-94.

The Emperor and the Little Girl; Bernard Shaw über Rechtschreibung, Wortteilung, Sperrdruck und andere Druckereifragen; Shaw's *Pygmalion* und Henry Sweet.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. X., June 1928—

- The Gerund preceded by the Common Case, II. (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 65-72.
A Study in historical syntax.

— August—

- The Taming of a Shrew* (A. P. van Dam), pp. 97-106.
The predicative Passive Infinitive (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 107-14.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVII., April 1928—

- The Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure* (Douglas Bush), pp. 162-69.
Pettie's sources and his treatment of them.
Grímur Thomsen—A Pioneer Byron Student (Richard Beck), pp. 170-82.

LIBRARY, Vol. IX., June 1928—

- Marks as Signatures (Charles Sisson), pp. 1-37.
The New Caxton Indulgence (A. W. Pollard), pp. 86-91.
With facsimile.
A Note on *A New Interlude* (Robert Steele), pp. 90-91.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XVIII., June 1928—

- Some Remarks on *Hudibras* (Edmund Blunden), pp. 172-77.

— July—

- Some Memories of Edmund Gosse (George Saintsbury), pp. 265-68.

— August—

- On the Dating of Lamb's Letters (G. A. Anderson), pp. 391-94.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLIII., June 1928—

- New Light on the Genesis of *The Ring and the Book* (W. O. Raymond), pp. 357-68.
Misdating of Browning's first reference to the poem.
The Letters of Abraham Cowley (A. H. Nethercot), pp. 369-75.
Two Unpublished Letters by Coleridge in Contemporary Newspapers (T. M. Raysor), pp. 375-78.
In *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal*, 1814, and in *The Courier*, 1810.
What is the *Parlement of Foules*? (T. W. Douglas), pp. 378-84.
On the identity of persons represented.
Mrs. Bracegirdle's Acting in Crowne's *Justice Busy* (R. G. Noyes), pp. 390-91.
Explanation of reference in Downes' *Roscius Anglicanus*.
Notes on Milton's Appearance (S. A. Nock), pp. 391-93.
A Note on the Bibliography of Keats (C. Gohdes), p. 393.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXIII., July 1928—

- Sir Walter Scott and Maria Edgeworth. Some Unpublished Letters (Harriet J. Butler and H. E. Butler), pp. 273-98.

Beowulf, ll. 168-9 (S. J. Crawford), p. 336.

King Alfred's "Götland" (Kemp Malone), pp. 336-39.

"Yokel" and "Loaf" (Josef Bihl), p. 340.

John Fisher's English Sermons (W. A. G. Doyle-Davidson), pp. 341-342.

Benlowes: a Seventeenth Century Plagiarist (H. J. L. Robbie), pp. 342-44.

Was George Borrow ever in Denmark? (Herbert G. Wright), p. 345.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., May 1928—

The Origin of the Dialectal Differences in Spoken American English (Hans Kurath), pp. 385-95.

Dryden versus Settle (Roswell G. Ham), pp. 409-16.

Dryden, Hobbes, and the Royal Society (Louis I. Bredvold), pp. 417-38.

Thomson and the Countess of Hertford (Helen S. Hughes), pp. 439-68.

Evidence of Alnwick MSS.

The Rôle of Gulliver (John B. Moore), pp. 469-80.

Documents and Records: Chaucer abroad in 1368 (Edith Rickert), pp. 511-12.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. XIII., July 1928—

De geschiedenis van het Hamletprobleem (H. de Groot), pp. 282-93.

Het Angelsaksische raadsel 58 (A. E. H. Swaen), pp. 293-96.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CIV., August 1928—

The Plays of Sean O'Casey (Walter Starkie), pp. 225-36.

Chaucer's Physician and his Forbears (H. H. Bashford), pp. 237-48.

Puritan Bunyan and Catholic Dante (Mary W. Smyth), pp. 249-66.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 154, May 5, 1928—

Unpublished Letters of Warren Hastings (H. B.), pp. 309-310.

Continued weekly till June 9. Notes by P. D. Mundy, May 12, p. 336; by Evan Cotton, May 26, p. 372.

The Authorship of *Edward III.* (S. R. Golding), pp. 313-15.

Evidence of Robert Wilson's authorship.

— May 12—

Robert Wilson and *Sir Thomas More*: Wilson's First Play (S. O. Addy).

Reply by S. A. Tannenbaum, June 30, pp. 465, 466.

— May 26—

A Matter-of-Lie Man (John M. Turnbull), pp. 364-65.

Lamb's retailing of humorous stories.

As You Like It : De Bois ; Weston-in-Arden (Rowland O'H. Boyce), pp. 368, 369.

Reply by Alfred Ransford, June 30, pp. 461-63.

"Cat" in Place-Names (L. R. M. Strachan), p. 374.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 154, June 23—

Edmund and his Father (E. G.), p. 440.

Note on *King Lear*, I. ii.

— June 30—

A Neglected Factor in Place-Names (Alfred Watkins), pp. 455-58.

The Track Maker. Continued Vol. 155, July 7, pp. 4-7 ; July 28, pp. 60-2. Note by S. O. Addy, July 28, p. 70.

"God's Acre" : "Church Acre" (Albert Matthews), p. 464.

— Vol. 155, July 5—

The Cock at Temple Bar (Kenneth Rogers), pp. 3-4.

Site of Ale-House visited by Pepys. Note by Ambrose Heal, July 28, p. 67.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VII., July 1928—

The Influence of Trissino on *The Faerie Queene* (C. W. Lemmi), pp. 220-23.

Notes on the Puppet Play of Doctor Faust (John A. Walz), pp. 224-30.

I. The Latin exclamations at the end of the play ; II. Twenty-four years in twelve.

Southey's Eclogues (E. C. Knowlton), pp. 231-41.

Reconstruction of a Lost Play (Henry David Gray), pp. 254-74.

Kyd's *Hamlet*.

Verse-Sentence Patterns in English Poetry (Charles A. Langworthy), pp. 283-98.

Contemporary Politics in Elizabethan Drama : Fulke Greville (E. P. Kuhl), pp. 299-302.

A Jonson Allusion, and Others (Bernard M. Wagner), pp. 306-8.

In MS. c. 1654.

Lyttelton (Franklin P. Johnson), pp. 309-310.

Unpublished poem in MS. collection.

A Possible Source of Browning's *Saul* (George S. Wykoff), pp. 311-14.

Charles Mackay's *Saul and David*.

Query on Chaucer's Burgesses (Carroll Camden, Jr.), pp. 314-17.

Were they an afterthought ?

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Vol. XLIII., June 1928.

The Coward Knight and the Damsel of the Car (Helen Muchnic), pp. 323-42.

Gawain, Gwri, and Cuchulinn (Roger S. Loomis), pp. 384-96.

Rose and Cypress (Kemp Malone), pp. 397-446.

Origin and variants.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

- Charlotte Smith, Pre-Romantic Novelist (James R. Foster), pp. 463-75.
- The Stage Adventures of some Gothic Novels (Willard Thorp), pp. 476-86.
- Sir Walter Scott's Review of Jane Austen's *Emma* (William Reitzel), pp. 487-93.
Questioning Scott's authorship.
- Charlotte Brontë's Angrian Cycle of Stories (Fannie E. Ratchford), pp. 494-501.
- The English Controversy over Realism in Fiction, 1885-1895 (William C. Frierson), pp. 533-50.
- The Genealogical Novel, a New Genre (A. E. Zucker), pp. 551-60.
- Milton and Marston (Alwin Thaler), pp. 569-70.
- The Earl of Westmoreland* and *Bueve de Hantone* (Arthur Dickson), p. 570.
- Additional Notes on John Johnson's Diary (Hoxie N. Fairchild), pp. 571-572.
- Who was Henry Porter? (E. H. C. Oliphant), pp. 572-75.
- Hamlet* Q₁ and Mr. Henry David Gray (J. Dover Wilson), pp. 575-78.
Reply by H. D. Gray, pp. 578-82.
- Coleridge, Wordsworth and Mr. Lowes (Lane Cooper), pp. 582-92.
- REVUE ANGLLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. 5, June 1928—
Quelques notes sur l'exotisme de Stevenson (Louis Bonnerot), pp. 439-51.
- Rossetti et le moyen âge (Lucien Wolff), pp. 452-58.
- Shakespeare, *King Lear*, 1. i. 199, *dear* (J. Derocquigny), pp. 459-61.
- STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXV., July 1928—
Shakespeare and *Titus Andronicus* (Austin K. Gray), pp. 295-311.
- Shakespeare and Hayward (Ernest P. Kuhl), pp. 312-15.
- Some Eighteenth Century Chaucer Allusions (Richmond P. Bond), pp. 316-39.
- Planché's Early Classical Burlesques (Dougald MacMillan), pp. 340-45.
- John Dunton's Connection with Book-Reviewing (Roger P. McCutcheon), pp. 346-61.
- TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 3, 1928—
George and Samuel Tuke (William S. Clark), p. 334.
Conflicting evidence as to authorship of *The Adventures of Five Hours*.
Reply by A. E. H. Swaen, May 24, p. 396.
- Shakespeare's "Curtains" (Richmond Noble), p. 334.
Reply by C. M. Haines, May 10, p. 358.

Carlyle and Goethe (F. Melian Stawell), p. 334.

Correspondence continued by C. F. Baker and Norwood Young, May 10, p. 358.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 10—

Ben Jonson and the Elizabethan Tacitus (Sir Israel Gollancz), p. 355.

I. Was "A. B." the Earl of Essex? II. Ben Jonson and Greneway's "Annals." Reply by Percy Simpson, June 14, p. 450; by Sir I. Gollancz, June 21, p. 468.

Shakespeare's "Purge" of Jonson (Arthur Gray), p. 358.

Reply by George Greenwood, May 17, p. 379.

The Text of "The School for Scandal" (M. J. Ryan), p. 358.

Reply by R. Crompton Rhodes, May 24, p. 396; by M. J. Ryan, June 7, p. 430.

Jonson's "A Tale of a Tub" (E. R. Brown), p. 358.

Reply by Percy Simpson, May 17, p. 379.

May 17—

"A Game at Chesse" (R. C. Bald), p. 379.

The long "s" and "Ye" (M. J. Ryan), p. 379.

On Eighteenth Century usage. Reply by R. W. Chapman, May 24, p. 396.

Jemmy Laroche, the Boy Singer (W. J. Lawrence), p. 379.

Date of "The Raree Show." Further note by C. H. Firth, May 31, p. 412.

May 24—

"The Taming of the Shrew" (W. W. Greg), p. 396.

Variations in title in the later Folios.

"The Watsons" (John H. Hubback), p. 396.

May 31—

Sir George Etherege (Dorothy Foster), p. 412.

Biographical details.

Ben Jonson, Stow and Drummond (Oliver W. F. Lodge), p. 412.

Explanation of reference in the *Conversations*.

Burns and Rudel (Janet M. Smith), p. 412.

Reply by E. G. W. Braunholtz, June 7, pp. 430, 431.

"The Affectionate Parents' Gift" (F. J. Harvey Darton), p. 412.

June 7—

Pepys, Le Sueur and Gibbons (Mrs. Esdaile), p. 428.

Notes by Walter H. Whitear, June 21, p. 469, and by W. G. C. Probert, June 28, p. 487.

"Litel Lowis my Sone" (John M. Manly), p. 430.

Reference to Lewis Chaucer. Reply by Walter Rye, June 28, p. 486.

"The Taming of the Shrew" (Peter Alexander), p. 430.

Authorship of "A Shrew."

Meres's "Palladis Tamia" (F. S. Ferguson), p. 430.

Bibliographical details.

Wakefield Mysteries (Matthew H. Peacock), p. 431.

References in the Wakefield Burgess Rolls for 1556.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, June 14—

Burnet and the "Characters" of John Macky I. (William A. Shaw),
p. 449.

Concluded June 21, p. 466. Supplementary note June 28, p. 486. Further
note by H. E. Salter, July 5, p. 504.

Thomas Warton's Poems (Dixon Wecter), p. 449.

Bibliographical note. Reply by Percival F. Hinton, July 12, p. 520.

A Classical Quotation in "II. Henry VI." (Percy Z. Round), p. 449.

Note on iv. i. 117. Reply by Edgar I. Fripp, June 21, p. 468.

Stephen Hawes (Gordon S. Humphreys), p. 450.

On *The Comfort of Lovers*. Reply by P. Parker, June 21, p. 468.

June 21—

Cant words in the N. E. D. (John Sampson), p. 468.

Lowre ; ken ; mort ; wyn ; bywayman.

Anna Seward (Margaret Ashmun), p. 468.

Date of birth. Note by A. L. Reade, June 28, p. 487.

Morris's "Summer Dawn" (P. Rogers), p. 468.

June 28—

Quotations by Wordsworth (Lane Cooper), p. 486.

Source of some "untraced" quotations.

A Sheridan Pamphlet (Percival F. Hinton), p. 486.

The Prince of Wales' reply to Pitt's Letter of December 30, 1788.

July 5—

A Lost "Boke of Balettes" (? 1550-1600) (R. H. Griffith), p. 504.

Poems from odd leaves used in binding. Note by E. M. W. Tillyard,
July 12, p. 520.

"Class" as a Library Term (Paget Toynbee), p. 504.

Anthony Foster (W. G. D. Fletcher), p. 504.

Question of identity.

July 12—

A Shakespeare Problem (J. Middleton Murry), p. 520.

The Player's speech in *Hamlet* and *The Tragedie of Dido*.

Censorship during the Commonwealth (W. M. Clyde), p. 520.

Incident recorded in Howell's *Philanglus*.

Bunyan's "One Thing is Needful" (William Talbot), p. 520.

Bibliographical note.

A Puzzling Point in "A Woman is a Weathercock" (W. J. Lawrence),
p. 520.

Abbreviation in stage direction, Act II. scene i.

July 19—

Tamquam Explorator (M. J. Ryan), p. 536.

Note on Jonson's motto.

July 26—

Froissart and Otterburn (Historicus), p. 552.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1928

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class I.—Elizabeth H. Maxwell.

Class II.—J. O. Bartley, L. Agnes Campbell, Kathleen D. Crothers, Margaret E. M. Earls, Ellen Wilson.

Class III.—Mary Crawford, E. Cullen, Enid M. L. Henry, S. C. Kennedy, Maureen E. K. McKeown.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class I.—Dorothy L. Graham, Hilda Q. Iredale, Frances A. Smith.

Class II.—Kathleen H. Baker, S. B. Beck, A. L. Bennett, P. T. Bourne, Enid M. Carter, Constance E. Clark, Betty L. Cook, G. A. E. Cornforth, Nesta K. Crump, Marjorie R. Fenning, E. Jarratt, A. R. Maiden, M. F. Perrins, Lois H. Rodway, H. C. Sherwood, C. A. Swift.

Class III.—Constance T. S. Blyth, Winifred M. Cook, H. Lamb.

Classified on completion of Subsidiary Subject.

Class II.—A. H. Minett.

BRISTOL.—English :

Class II.—Div. 1 : Betty V. Burchill, Audrey M. R. Carlson, Elsie Ryness, Thelma A. Smith, Enid A. Weaving. *Div. 2 :* Marjorie E. Buchan, Phyllis D. Evans, Ivy F. Eyles, Margaret A. B. Jones, Elsie M. E. Williams, Phyllis M. Wood.

Class III.—Ruby Baxter, Mildred J. Edmed, Mary L. L. Tomkins.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos.

Section A.—Old Regulations

Class I.—A. S. Bokhari (Emm.), H. L. Elvin (Trin. H.), L. C. Knights (Selw.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : W. E. Barron (Jes.), M. Gilbert (Down.), Ds D. A. Norwood (Christ's), H. Oldman (Selw.), W. E. Rose (Sid. Suss.), Ds D. Shillan (Christ's). *Div. 2 :* L. E. Bunker (Trin.), H. A. Cartledge (Sid. Suss.), H. Coward (Selw.), J. G. Graham (Down.), N. M. Kennaby (Queens'), J. S. Kirkman (Cai.), S. Moorey (Selw.), H. J. Murphy (Down.), W. Peach (Selw.), I. R. R. Richmond (Jes.), P. C. Romans (Pet.), A. G. Standing (Trin. H.), Ds L. C. van Geyzel (Joh.), C. Wells (Christ's).

Class III.—V. C. H. Creer (Trin.), C. S. Crowson (Down.), E. S. Etheridge (Sid. Suss.), G. K. Griffin (Trin. H.), D. R. N. Macnutt (Jes.), J. R. Roget (Trin.), H. F. Turner (Down.), D. A. C. Tyrie (Selw.), J. K. White (Selw.).

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1928 507

WOMEN

Class I.—*Q. D. Roth (Girton).

Class II.—*Div. 1*: H. L. Addison (Newn.), K. M. Bloor (Newn.), L. E. Disney (Girton), M. M. E. Hammond (Newn.), C. Thyne (Girton), A. E. M. Wamsley (Newn.), D. E. Whitford (Newn.). *Div. 2*: K. E. Barrett (Girton), S. Buckley (Newn.), F. M. R. Grylls (Girton), E. D. Titley (Girton).

Class III.—E. Harari (Girton).

Part I.—New Regulations

Class I.—E. W. Allam (King's), E. A. Evetts (Sid. Suss.), A. C. Frost (Cla.), F. H. S. Jennings (Pemb.), J. L. Smeall (Queens').

Class II.—*Div. 1*: H. Cooper (Sid. Suss.), R. G. Eberhart (Joh.), J. A. Kay (Down.), W. W. Lillie (Queens'), A. R. Parker (Corp. Chr.), J. C. Saunders (King's), J. W. Skillington (non-coll.), J. A. Slattery (Christ's), G. H. Stainforth (Emm.), E. J. Taylor (Sid. Suss.), J. C. Thornton (Corp. Chr.). *Div. 2*: T. A. Amos (Cath.), J. W. F. Arrow (Joh.), S. L. Bethell (Selw.), H. E. Bird (Emm.), R. D. Caesar (Cla.), F. A. J. Cole (Christ's), B. C. Crouch (Joh.), R. Emery (Christ's), Viscount Ennismore (Magd.), D. J. N. Flower (King's), D. L. Graham (Jes.), D. O. W. Hall (Jes.), J. F. Hammond (non-coll.), J. Jamieson (Emm.), J. A. Jerome (Emm.), W. R. C. Joyce (Queens'), J. Lister (Trin.), A. Macdonald (Joh.), J. H. E. P. Marks (Magd.), K. Mason (Cath.), A. E. R. Roberts (Jes.), D. J. Stevens (Emm.), J. L. Sweeney (Magd.), H. Walpole (Magd.), A. R. Williamson (Trin. H.).

Class III.—S. E. Aldridge (Down.), G. C. Barton (King's), J. Black (Christ's), V. J. Brown (Christ's), P. B. H. Burton (Trin.), F. Cadle (Pemb.), A. F. R. Carling (Pet.), F. S. Chapman (Joh.), R. R. Clifford (Trin. H.), T. G. Connell (Emm.), C. H. Duell (Joh.), R. L. Findlay (Pemb.), R. Horrox (Christ's), C. H. James (non-coll.), A. Kerr (Cla.), R. H. Kelley (Selw.), J. F. C. Kingsley (Trin.), G. H. Knight (Pet.), J. M. Y. Phillipson (Cath.), B. T. Pollock (Cai.), E. J. M. Pullan (Joh.), J. W. Rattray (Magd.), W. F. Russell (Queens'), A. E. Whiting (Pet.), A. H. Williams (Trin.).

WOMEN

Class I.—G. Freeman (Girton), E. M. Furtado (Newn.), U. Makower (Newn.), *E. E. Phare (Newn.), L. J. Pickles (Newn.).

Class II.—*Div. 1*: Z. L. Caplan (Newn.), U. K. N. Carter (Newn.), R. Dowswell (Newn.), S. G. Fry (Newn.), A. M. Henderson (Newn.), E. E. Hurst (Newn.), U. F. Martindale (Newn.), J. E. Morwood (Girton), L. Peters (Girton), P. Royston (Girton), K. M. Watts (Girton), K. M. Whiting (Girton). *Div. 2*: D. A. H. Buck (Newn.), S. Cockayne (Newn.), S. E. De Wet (Newn.), I. S. R. Drummond (Girton), M. Heath (Newn.), D. M. Hutchinson (Newn.), W. E. Midgley (Girton), B. M. Nixon (Newn.).

Class III.—M. M. S. van Woudenberg (Newn.).

An asterisk denotes special distinction.

DURHAM.—English Language and Literature :

Class II.—E. Dickinson (St. Hild.'s), Doris J. Edington (Arms.), J. Harrison (Univ.), R. D. W. H. Pearce (Arms.), Muriel A. Soulsby (St. Mary's), Sydney J. Stewart (Hatf.).

Class III.—Mabel Lamb (St. Mary's), Florence V. Lambert (St. Mary's), Nora E. Richardson (Arms.), Nancie E. Rigby (Neville's X.), T. C. Tate (Bede), Elizabeth Wilkinson (Arms.), Mary Wilson (St. Mary's).

LEEDS.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Ida L. Pickles.

Class II.—Kathleen M. Binns, Kathleen M. Brook, Phyllis Hainsworth, Barbara de L. Holmes, Alice M. Jackson, Amy L. Jordan, Edith Jubb, Mary Miller, Dorothy M. Watson.

Class III.—Marjorie King, Ida K. Maslen.

Ægotat.—Muriel R. Jeffery.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

Part I.—Margaret M. Byrne, Kathleen Corrigan, Ellen E. Foley, P. A. Gaskell, G. G. Hough, Ellen A. Howard, Dorothy Inglis, Gertrude M. Mitchell, Wilhelmina Morrissey, Mary E. Nichols, Emma C. J. Price, Amy E. G. Sephton, Muriel Smalley, Katie Smethurst, G. A. Topp, H. Towers, Mary Wallhouse, Lily D. Whiteley.

English (Modern English Literature) :

Part II.—Class I. : J. K. Thomas, Phyllis H. Whittaker.

Class II.—Div. 1 : Annie M. Evans, L. B. C. Howard, Rhona Pride, Joyce E. Procter, Elizabeth K. Williams. *Div. 2* : Dorothy A. Edwards, Beryl Gough, Margaret G. Lawson.

Ægotat.—A. W. Ellis.

LONDON (Internal).—English :

Class I.—E. J. Burton (U. C.), Cicely M. Davies (George Smith Studentship) (Westfield), Kathleen M. Dexter (Westfield), Gertrude N. Drew (Westfield), Jessie M. Dundas (U. C.), Joan E. Faiers (King's), Phyllis M. Opie (U. C.), Dorothy C. Pitts (King's), J. C. Roberts (Birkbeck), W. F. J. Roberts (U. C.), Marjorie A. Shepard, (U. C.), Lydia N. Williams (Westfield).

Class II.—Div. 1 : Betty D. Anson (U. C.), Eva P. Cecil (Holloway), C. J. W. Cook (King's), Lorna M. Davidson (U. C.), Dorothy A. Drake (Holloway), Frances Emanuel (U. C.), Noreen M. Fletcher (King's), Muriel C. Greening (Westfield), W. G. Hargest (E. L. C.), Edith Hooper (U. C.), Winifred P. Hossack (U. C.), Winifred B. C. Jewsbury (Bedford), Hilary B. Knight (E. L. C.), Florence A. Martin (E. L. C.), Lilian F. Pye (U. C.), Constance L. Robinson (U. C.), Elsie R. Russell (U. C.), Edith Schofield (Bedford), Olive M. Thomas (King's), Gertrude A. Townsend (King's), A. A. Wood (King's). *Div. 2* : Sheila K. Arkell (U. C.), Elizabeth M. Bagnall (U. C.), Georgina Baker (King's), Ada E. Barton (U. C.), Josephine M. F. Blocksidge (Holloway), Muriel J. R. Briggs (Westfield), Elsie M. Brown (Westfield), Mary E. F. Burrell (King's),

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1928 509

Joani W. Burrows (King's), C. J. Cox (King's), Grace E. Dawes (King's), Elsie M. Fisher (E. L. C.), Winifred H. Flanagan (King's), Jennie F. Forrester (King's), Bertha Gaster (U. C.), Rosalie M. Gibbard (U. C.), Margery D. Gillam (Bedford), Dora M. Hooper (King's), Mary E. Hopper (Bedford), J. B. W. Hughes (King's), Elsie M. Humphries (Westfield), Mary W. Huntly (Westfield), A. W. Huston (King's), Elizabeth J. Landon (Westfield), Winifred M. C. Lodge (Holloway), Jessie B. MacGibbon (Holloway), Marjorie G. Payne (King's), Muriel L. Perkins (King's), Marjory E. Ridges (U. C.), Muriel I. Sholl (Holloway), Beatrice M. Sleight (King's), S. F. Spratt (Birkbeck), Margery Weatherseed (King's), G. E. L. Wills (U. C.), Doris M. J. Wise (King's), Edith C. Woolford (Bedford), Joan F. Wright (Holloway).

Class III.—Victoria M. Barraclough (U. C.), Coralie F. Brooks (U. C.), Barbara Butler (King's), Lucy M. Cave (Westfield), Marjorie S. Clough (Bedford), A. J. Crawley (King's), Joan A. M. Davis (Westfield), Constance E. Goodwin (Holloway), Freda Halsey (King's), W. W. Hardie (E. L. C.), Sybel M. Hornsby (Bedford), W. G. Jackson (King's), Winifred M. Jacob (King's), Fanny Jochelman (U. C.), Constance I. Leonard (Bedford), W. J. Lomax (U. C.), J. W. Partridge (U. C.), Beatrice E. Pascall (Westfield), Kathleen R. Pennell (U. C.), Ruth E. F. Pollard (Bedford), Winnifred Y. Rainier (Bedford), Margaret I. Ramsden (Holloway), C. G. Reed (King's), Jean K. Reekie (U. C.), Elsie M. Richards (King's), Cecilia M. Riley (U. C.), H. B. Smith (King's), Constance V. Watson (U. C.).

LONDON (External).—English :

Class I.—Mary W. Barham (U. C.), Ethel Bird (U. C. South.), Aurora C. Coles (U. C.), Frances A. Glover (U. C. South.), H. D. Gray (Univ. of Reading), Phyllis D. Hicks (Priv.), W. E. Jarrett (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), R. E. Mitchell (King's), Margaret C. Ridgers (U. C. South.), Jessie Small (Univ. of Reading), Susie I. Tucker (U. C. Ex.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : V. S. Bayliss (Priv.), J. H. Butler (U. C. South.), Elsie A. Dyer (Priv.), Ruth A. Hatwell (Priv.), Frances M. Hawke (U. C. Leicester), H. A. Prentice (U. C.), Ivy G. Pusey (King's), Margaret Shepherd (Sacred Heart, Roehampton), B. Shutske (Borough Rd. Coll.), Doris M. C. Skews (U. C. Ex.), Freda L. Templeton (Univ. of Reading), H. N. Winter (Birkbeck and Priv.). *Div. 2* : E. W. C. Ashton (U. C. Nott.), Marjorie H. Barker (U. C. Nott.), F. W. Bath (Priv.), Joan M. Beecroft (Univ. of Reading), Mary E. Bliss (Priv.), Monica E. M. Bolton (U. C. Leicester), M. R. McR. Cann (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), J. Covington (U. C. South.), H. L. Davies (Priv.), Kathleen A. Deacon (U. C. South.), Edith E. T. Dimond (Priv.), Marjorie F. Edwards (Univ. of Reading), Norah E. Elliot (Univ. of Reading), F. G. Gardener (Priv.), H. J. Gibney (Priv.), Evelyn Hanmer (U. C. Nott.), T. S. Jones (Priv.), T. R. Key (Univ. of Reading), T. H. H. Kilborn (U. C. Leicester), A. E. Mainhood (Priv.), Winifred E. Mapleston (Univ. of Reading), D. Mouat (Borough Rd. Coll.), Mary G. Neylan (Bedford Coll.), A. J. Nurse (Priv.), P. J. Osborn (U. C. South.), Florence A. Parry (Notre Dame Liverpool),

Lucy N. Pomfrett (Univ. of Reading and Priv.), Phyllis Slader (U. C. South.), Vera I. Stanley (U. C. Ex.), Edith M. Urch (U. C. Ex. and Priv.), E. V. Warne (Priv.), Evelyn M. Wood (U. C. Nott.), R. R. Zanker (U. C. Leicester).

Class III.—D. M. G. Aspa (Priv.), F. T. Bennett (Priv.), W. C. C. Blackford (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), Annie H. Brakenridge (U. C. Nott.), Eva Browne (Priv.), J. Burns (Priv.), T. Cain (Priv.), Jean S. Campbell (Priv.), W. L. Chapman-Andrews (U. C. Ex.), Ellen Claydon (Priv.), Winifred V. Covell (Priv.), T. Crehan (Priv.), J. Dawson (Priv.), F. T. Garratt (Brighton Tech. Coll.), Marjorie E. Goodall (U. C. Nott.), G. R. Haigh (Priv.), Gwendolen C. Hall (Brighton Tech. Coll.), A. J. B. Hutchings (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John), A. Kennedy (Priv.), W. H. J. Knight (Priv.), R. Lester (Priv.), K. M. Lobb (U. C. Ex.), C. L. Rice (Priv.), A. McD. B. Rule (Birmingham and Mid. Inst. and Priv.), J. K. Suckling (Borough Rd. Coll.), W. Toplis (Priv.), Violet E. Wackett (Priv.), J. C. Wilkin (Coll. of St. Mark and St. John).

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Florence Hough, F. M. Worthen.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Dorothy Boothman, Joan W. Edmundson, N. Furlong, Marjorie Gillmour, Dorothy Hallows, Mary Hargreaves, Agnes Holroyd, Marian A. Playfoot, Annie Smith. *Div. 2* : Lena Booth, Florence Brunton, Annie E. L. Burtt, Clara J. Connolly, Sallie Cragge, Phyllis M. Fitton, T. R. Frame, Dorothy Hodge, Mary Lansdale, Alice McCarthy, V. Nelson, Bertha Slinger.

Class III.—W. A. Camm, Mabel E. Hudson, Ena B. Kenadjian, W. Neate, C. Talbot.

OXFORD.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—G. D. Bone (St. John's), W. C. Donnelly (Camp. Hall), J. Fisher (Univ.), J. I. M. Stewart (Oriol), Sybil M. Schreiber (H.-S.), Annabella M. White (L. M. H.).

Class II.—V. D. Barker (Ball.), M. D. Binns (Exeter), W. H. Browne (Jesus), J. R. H. Chisholm (Ch. Ch.), A. B. Cook (St. John's), R. N. Cunningham (Queen's), J. P. Curgenvin (Hertf.), B. Davenport (Exeter), R. L. Edwards (Oriol), E. Foers (St. John's), J. T. Jones (Univ.), R. W. Ketton-Cremer (Ball.), S. V. Larkey (Pemb.), S. J. M. Money (Pemb.), M. C. Nahm (Hertf.), F. G. Roberts (St. Edm. Hall), F. M. Roy (St. John's), J. H. Taylor (Univ.), S. Thomas (Keble), L. Wilkinson (Keble), P. Young (St. Edm. Hall); Kathleen M. Abbott (St. Hug.), Enid E. Allinson (L. M. H.), Katharine L. Ball (St. Hug.), Marjorie J. Birrell (St. Hild.), Mary P. C. Blaxland (H.-S.), Mary P. Browne (L. M. H.), Audrey M. Cambridge (St. Hug.), Elizabeth L. Chandler (St. Hild.), Dulcie E. H. Darker (St. Hug.), Shelagh S. Deacon (St. Hug.), Joyce B. Handley-Seymour (Som.), Elizabeth A. Hardman (Som.), Frances F. Hicks (H.-S.), Helen M. Holmes (St. Hild.), Janet G. Irving (St. Hild.), Margaret D. Lahey (St. Hild.), Margaret W. Lane (St. Hug.), Margaret J. Lavender (St. Hild.), Margery E. Lee (L. M. H.), Jessie L. Lloyd (H.-S.), Catherine D. Martin (Som.), Edith D. Price (St. Hild.), Katharine H.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1928 511

Ripman (L. M. H.), Jean Ross (Som.), Anne G. Rowe (L. M. H.), Ursula Todd-Naylor (St. Hug.).

Class III.—W. H. Auden (Ch. Ch.), A. R. Bailey (Wadh.), D. S. Batchelor (Worc.), D. M. Campbell (Worc.), G. K. Chalmers (Wadh.), J. H. T. Clarke (St. Edm. Hall), F. Crawford (Ball.), C. D. Dalley (Jesus), G. W. Dixon (Keble), P. W. Donner (Exeter), J. E. B. Hall (Worc.), F. L. M. Jellinek (Oriell), R. Keet (B. N. C.), C. H. B. Pell (non-coll.), F. G. Phillips (St. Edm. Hall), G. Po Saw (Jesus), R. P. Price (Wadh.), G. H. Pugh (Queen's), N. L. Stuart-King (Hertf.), E. A. Thorne (Keble), J. J. Timmis (Ball.), C. N. Tyzack (Keble), R. E. Warner (Wadh.), J. D. Westermann (Exeter), C. D. Wheeler (Queen's), W. N. Williams (Exeter), Nancy P. Abbott (St. Hug.), Susannah O. Allison (St. Hug.), Madge Bradbury (St. Hild.), Hilda G. Buckley (St. Hild.), Nancy Carter (L. M. H.), Beryl E. Caudwell (Som.), Eileen M. Challans (St. Hug.), Margaret A. K. Chase (H.-S.), Alice Cunningham (St. Hug.), Winifred A. Forth (St. Hug.), Audrey F. L. Fowler (St. Hug.), Alice E. Gasaway (H.-S.), Catharine M. Gavin (L. M. H.), Rosa George (H.-S.), Marion Haslam (L. M. H.), Gertrude E. Heaton (L. M. H.), Mary N. Hensman (St. Hug.), Hélène Héroys (L. M. H.), Hilda A. Holland (H.-S.), Marion Jackson (H.-S.), Olive C. M. Johnson (H.-S.), Cicely M. Keates (H.-S.), Stela D. Longmire (St. Hild.), Hester C. McLaren (L. M. H.), Winifred A. Millard (H.-S.), Marjorie Moore (H.-S.), Louisa S. Morris (H.-S.), Nina M. Muir (L. M. H.), Nita Myers (L. M. H.), Hon. Sylvia B. Norton (Som.), Aileen M. Norwood (L. M. H.), Kathleen M. Pearson (St. Hild.), Marion R. Poore (St. Hild.), Dorothy Price (H.-S.), Annie K. Robertson (St. Hug.), Beatrix E. Sears (Som.), Kathleen J. Shepherd (St. Hild.), Margaret J. Southarden (St. Hild.), Elizabeth Souttar (L. M. H.), Mary F. Taylor (H.-S.), Kathleen I. M. Verney (Som.), Jessie F. Wallace (H.-S.), Edna M. Whitehead (H.-S.).

Class IV.—W. J. S. Cooke (St. Edm. Hall), R. B. Cushman (Keble), G. M. Hayward (Hertf.), P. R. Jackson (non-coll.), C. Penfold (Pemb.), C. A. Tilghman (Ball.), B. R. Waters (Trin.); Elizabeth M. Oldfield (Som.), Isabelle M. Symington (H.-S.), Phyllis I. Woods (St. Hild.).

Ægrotant.—W. S. Graf (non-coll.), Mary I. Gendall (H.-S.).

Overstanding, satisfied the Examiners.—E. C. Taylor (Trin.).

SHEFFIELD.—English :

Class I.—E. Hargreaves, Isobel M. Linfoot.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : J. E. Oxley. *Div. 2* : Edith B. Parker.

Class III.—Majorie E. Bayes, W. E. Lord, Annie Wood.

WALES.—English :

Class I.—R. Davies (Swan.), H. M. Dowling (Card.), Winifred J. Griffiths (Ban.), Ceridwen M. James (Aber.), T. W. Jones (Card.), E. G. Lewis (Swan.), L. I. Lewis (Aber.), Eileen M. Morgan (Card.), Vera Thomas (Aber.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Gwilyn Bowen-Kenvyn (Card.), Dorothy G. Cash (Ban.), Sarah H. Davies (Swan.), C. V. England (Card.), L. England (Card.), Ethel Evans (Ban.), Marjorie M. E. Fletcher (Aber.), Martha A.

Jacob (Card.), E. J. Jenkins (Card.), C. D. L. Jones (Aber.), Margaret E. Jones (Ban.), Margaret B. Morgan (Card.), C. J. Nicholls (Card.), A. E. Organ (Card.), W. Rees (Swan.), F. E. Stanbury (Swan.), Rowena Taylor (Ban.), Joyce A. Terrett (Swan.), Mabel F. West (Card.), Dora A. C. Williams (Swan.), Nesta Williams (Card.) *Div. 2* : Amy N. M. Ballinger (Aber.), Alice N. Bishop (Card.), Edith S. Davies (Card.), Dorothy G. Evans (Aber.), F. Evans (Card.), Nancy M. Griffiths (Card.), P. J. B. Griffiths (Card.), Kathleen E. L. Hearn (Aber.), Mary G. Hughes (Card.), Elsie Jenkins (Swan.), Enid M. Jenkins (Ban.), Francis M. Jones (Card.), W. T. Jones (Swan.), Leah E. Knoyle (Aber.), Eiluned M. Lewis (Card.), W. J. C. Morgan (Swan.), Vera Norris (Card.), H. C. Thomas (Card.), Mary M. Tudor (Aber.), Louise J. Westlake (Card.), A. H. Williams (Swan.).

Class III.—J. C. Davies (Swan.), Gwyneth Davies (Card.), Rachel D. G. Davies (Card.), Winifred Lincoln (Card.), J. D. Phillips (Card.), Annie C. D. Roberts (Card.), J. F. Williams (Ban.), Mabel M. F. L. Williams (Swan.).

SCOTLAND (M.A.)

ABERDEEN.—English :

Class I.—Sheila I. Christie, W. R. Humphries, I. Macpherson, C. Strachan, R. S. Walker.

Class II.—Jessie R. F. Allan, J. R. Allan, W. G. Black, Elizabeth Cameron, Margaret Dougherty, A. M. McRae, A. D. J. Scott, J. H. Speirs, M. I. Strachan.

EDINBURGH.—English :

Class I.—G. W. Coutie, Frances E. Handasyde, A. Macdonald, Mary C. B. Reid.

Class II.—Norrie J. Boberg, Marjorie A. Brown, W. M'M. Campbell, J. A. Gibson, R. Hepburn, Jessie M. Innes, Jean B. Jamieson, G. More, A. C. Patterson, G. Seth, Margaret A. Simpson, A. Wilson.

Class III.—J. Gray, Margaret H. Milroy, Alison M. Oliver, Olive M. Woodward.

Act-di
W.
Act-In
Per
ren
Actus
Fol
Wil
Aken
his
Albri
Pul
rev
Amer
W.
Amer
rev
Andr
F.
Andr
M
Arun
Aust
Auth
art
Auto
rev
B., V
M
Bab
ic
Bagn
Bald
"
Bald
th
Bale
ar
Bar
Y
s

INDEX

- Act-divisions in Shakespeare*, article by W. W. Greg, 152
- Act-Intervals in Early Shakespearean Performances*, note by W. J. Lawrence, 78
- Actus Primus, Scena Prima*, in the First Folio, The Heading, note by E. E. Willoughby, 323
- Akenside, Mark, attribution of some of his work to Young, 114
- Albright, Evelyn Mary, her *Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640*, reviewed, 91; replies to review, 193
- American English, The Study of*, by W. A. Craigie, reviewed, 368
- American Slang*, by F. N. Scott, reviewed, 368
- Andreas e i Fati degli Apostoli*, trans. F. Olivero, noticed, 373
- Andrew, S. O., article on *The Dialect of Morte Arthure*, 418
- Arundell, D., and *Squire Trelooby*, 413
- Austen, Jane; see *Northanger Novels*
- Authorship of Squire Trelooby*, The, article by J. C. Hodges, 404
- Autolycus, The Pack of*, ed. Rollins, reviewed, 482
- B., W., and Massinger, note by A. K. McIlwraith, 326
- Babes Book and The Court of Sapience*, 108
- Bagnall, William, and Massinger, 327
- Bald, R. C., note on *Macbeth* and the "short" plays, 429
- Balderston, Katharine C., her *Census of the MSS. of Goldsmith* reviewed, 484
- Bale, John, his *Scriptorium illustrium* and William Roy, 31
- Barlow, Bishop William, Was [he] Friar Jerome Barlow? Article by A. Koszul, 25
- Barlow, Friar Jerome, presumed author of *Rede me and be not wroth*, 25
- Barnes, A. G., his edition of *The Rehearsal* and *The Critic* noticed, 374
- Barnes, A. S., and Bishop Barlow, 26
- Batho, Edith C., her *Ettrick Shepherd* reviewed, 356
- Beatty, A., his *William Wordsworth* reviewed, 358
- Beaumont and Fletcher, The Plays of*, by E. H. C. Oliphant, reviewed, 456
- Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire, The Place-Names of*, by A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, reviewed, 118
- Beer, E. S. de, article on the later life of S. Butler, 159
- Behn, Aphra, and *Covent Garden Drollery*, 470
- Bellamy, Daniel (senior), adaptation of *Love's Riddle*, 6
- Bellamy, Daniel (junior), imitation of *Naufragium Jocularis*, 14
- Biathanatos*, John Donne's, punctuation of, 296.
- Bickersteth, G. L., his *Leopardi and Wordsworth* noticed, 373
- Blake, William, his *Selected Poems* (World's Classics) noticed, 498
- Boadicea, Queen of Britain*, notes on, 79
- Boas, his *Introduction to the Reading of Shakespeare*, noticed, 498
- Bodleian Library, Shakespeariana in the*, noticed, 373; *Catalogue of Dictionary Exhibition*, noticed, 491
- Bonnard, Prof. G. A., notes on Milton's *Areopagitica*, 434
- Book-advertising in the Eighteenth Century, 415
- Book Collecting, The Elements of*, by I. A. Williams, reviewed, 247

- Booke of Sir Thomas Moore, The*, by S. A. Tannenbaum, reviewed, 237
 Bradner, Prof. Leicester, note on fore-runners of the Spenserian stanza, 207; his *Life and Poems of R. Edwards* reviewed, 445
 Brereton, Prof. J. le Gay, note on *Much Ado*, 84
 Brettle, R. E., on the "Poet Marston" letter to Sir F. Clifton, 212
 Brett-Smith, H. F. B., his edition of the *Works of Etherege* reviewed, 341; and of Peacock, vol. vi, 360
Bridal of Triermain, The, note on, 330
 Bridges, Robert, his *Collected Essays* noticed, 374
 Brinton, Crane, his *Political Ideas of the English Romanticists* reviewed, 113
British Museum Quarterly, noticed, 497
 Buckhurst, Helen T. McM., reviews by, 106, 440
Bugbears, The, resemblance between Cowley's *Naufragium Joculare* and, 11-12
Burial of the Mass, The, 27
 Bussy, John, as original of Chaucer's Franklin, 145
Butler, Samuel, The Later Life of, article by E. S. de Beer, 159; Butler's pension from Charles II, 165
Bygymnyng of þe World and þe End of Worlde, þe, reviewed, 106
 Byles, A. T. P., his edition of the *Ordre of Chyualry* reviewed, 440
 Byrchet, Peter, Puritan assassin, 44
 Byrne, M. St. C., review by, 355
 C., R. W., note on Young's *Night Thoughts*, 330; on *The Bridal of Triermain* and *Richard the Dauntless*, 330
 Calfe, Peter, and *The Virgins Character*, 64
Cambridge History of English Literature, The, vol. xv, noticed, 372
 Campbell, W. E., his edition of More's *Dialogue concerning Tyndale* reviewed, 352
 Caradoc of Lancarvan, Welsh historian, 70
 Carver, P. L., article on Hazlitt's Contributions to *The Edinburgh Review*, 385
 Case, R. H., review by, 474
 Chambers, Sir E. K., review by, 352
 Chambers, R. W., his *Saga and Myth of Sir T. More* noticed, 373
 Chapman, R. W., his edition of *Papers by Johnson and Dodd* reviewed, 245; review by, 360
 Chaucer, G., identity of his Franklin discussed, 145; his phrase "in termés," 439; Manly's *New Light on*, reviewed, 217
Chaucer's Pensions in April, 1385, note by A. J. Wyatt, 83; see also 216
 Chettle, H., his hand in the *More MS.*, 238
Citizen of the World, The, H. J. Smith's study reviewed, 111
 Clark, A. M., his *Bibliography of T. Heywood*, 135, 138, 141
 Clark, William S., article on the sources of the heroic play, 49
 Clifton, Sir Gervase, and John Marston, 86, 212
 Coleridge, S. T., his *Logic and Theory of Life*, 432, 433
Coleridgeana, notes by A. D. Snyder, 432
 Congreve, W., and *Squire Trelooby*, 404
Cornish Squire, The, and *Squire Trelooby*, 406
 Court Hands: see *Later Court Hands*
Court Masque, The, by Enid Welsford, reviewed, 463
Court of Sapience, The, ed. R. Spindler, reviewed, 108
Covent Garden Drollery, ed. G. Thorn Drury, reviewed, 468
 Cowley, Abraham, as *Dramatist*, article by A. H. Nethercot, 1; Cowley at Westminster School, 1, 2; and Thomas Randolph, 3; sources of *Love's Riddle*, 3-6; at Trinity, Cambridge, 8; and Thomas Heywood's *English Traveler*, 13; and Buckingham's *Rehearsal*, 23
 Craigie, Prof. W. A., his *Study of American English* reviewed, 368
 Crashaw, Richard, *The Poems of*, ed. Martin, reviewed, 349
 Curll, E., and Edward Young, 414
Cutter of Coleman-Street, acted at Davenant's theatre (1661), 19; other performances, 20
 Cynthia, Sir W. Raleigh's, 129, 340

Dancer
 137
 Darbis
 Davis,
 Day, M.
 Sain
 Defens
 Delatt
 revie
 Dent,
 and
 Dialog
 thes
 Dialog
 revie
 Dicken
 revie
 Dobr
 Tra
 Dodd
 Dodd
 Donn
 by I
 two
 H.
 Doug
 Dram
 tion
 Dram
 164
 rev
 193
 Drayn
 viti
 Pol
 Ge
 Drur
 nas
 Co
 Dryd
 her
 one
 Ha
 Du K
 tion
 D'U
 cri
 43
 Dyah
 hu
 Early
 Po

- Dancer, J., his *English Lovers*, 1662, 137
- Darbishire, Helen, review by, 487
- Davis, B. E. C., reviews by, 120, 354
- Day, Mabel, reply to H. L. Savage on *Saint Erkenwald*, 90
- Defensio Curatorum* reviewed, 106
- Delattre, Floris, his *Dickens et la France* reviewed, 366
- Dent, Arthur, his *Plaine Mans Pathway* and Shakespeare, 83
- Dialogue describing the originall ground of these Lutheran faccions*, A, 27
- Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum* reviewed, 106
- Dickens et la France*, by Floris Delattre, reviewed, 366
- Dobrée, Bonamy, his *Five Restoration Tragedies* noticed, 497
- Dodd, Dr., 245
- Dodds, A. E., reviews by, 358, 359
- Donne, John, article on his punctuation by Evelyn M. Simpson, 295; note on two more undescribed MSS. of, by H. J. L. Robbie, 212
- Doughty, O., review by, 113
- Drama: see *Eighteenth Century, Restoration*
- Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640*, by Evelyn May Albright, reviewed, 91; reply to review of, 193
- Drayton, Michael, article by I. Gourvitch on the Welsh element in his *Polyolbion*, 69; and on his debt to Geoffrey of Monmouth, 394
- Drury, G. Thorn, his edition of *Par-nassus Biceps* reviewed, 241; and of *Covent Garden Drollery*, 468
- Dryden, John, his conception of the heroic play, 51; *An Adaptation of one of Dryden's Plays*, note by R. D. Havens, 88
- Du Halde, Goldsmith and his *Description . . . de l'empire de la Chine*, 113
- D'Urfey, T., note on a song of his ascribed to Shadwell, by D. M. W., 431
- Dyaloge betwene a gentillman and a husbandman*, A proper, 28
- Early English Miracle Plays*, ed. Pollard, noticed, 374
- Edinburgh Review*, *The*, Hazlitt's Contributions to, 385
- Edwards, Richard, note on two songs of, by H. E. Rollins, 204; his *Life and Poems*, by L. Bradner, reviewed, 445
- Eighteenth Century Drama, A History of Late*, by Allardyce Nicoll, reviewed, 355
- Ellis-Fermor, Miss U. M., her *Christopher Marlowe* reviewed, 447
- Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Lyly's "Euphues" and in Pettie's "Petite Pallace"*, by M. P. Tilley, reviewed, 354
- Elizabeth, Queen, references to her marriage in contemporary drama, 425
- Endymion*, ed. Notcutt, reviewed, 485
- English Grammar for Dutch Students*, Vol. I., by E. Kruisinga, reviewed, 494
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vol. xii, reviewed, 120; vol. xiii, reviewed, 495
- Essex Place-Names, Unfractured Forms in Thirteenth Century*, note on, 331
- Etherege, Sir George, his *Works*, ed. Brett-Smith, reviewed, 341
- Estrick Shepherd, The*, by E. C. Batho, reviewed, 356
- Everett, Dorothy, reviews by, 108, 220
- Famous Victories of Henry V, The*, article by B. M. Ward, 270; analysis of the play, 273; sources, 278; authorship, 281
- Field, L., review by, 245
- FitzRalph, Richard, his *Defensio Curatorum* (trans. Trevisa (?), ed. Perry) reviewed, 106
- Flood, W. H. Grattan, notes on a John Marston letter, 86; *On the Death of Dr. Robert Levett*, 88
- Floris and Blancheflour*, ed. A. B. Taylor, reviewed, 220
- Forerunners of the Spenserian Stanza*, note by Leicester Bradner, 207
- Fortune in Her Wits*, 14
- Franklin, The*, article by H. L. Wood-Legh, 145

- Gaw, Allison, his *Origin and Development of 1 Henry VI* reviewed, 100
- Gee, J. A., his *Life and Works of Lupset* reviewed, 441
- Geoffrey of Monmouth, Drayton's debt to him, 394
- Gilson, J. P., review by, 227; letter on Raleigh's *Cynthia*, 340
- "God it wite," 334
- Godwin, William, and Crabb Robinson, 167
- Goldsmith, Oliver, [his] *Citizen of the World*, by H. J. Smith, reviewed, 111; *A Census of the MSS. of*, by K. C. Balderston, reviewed, 484
- Gosse, Sir Edmund, and Cowley's dramas, 17, 22; and *Squire Trelooby*, 407
- Gourvitch, I., article on the Welsh element in the *Polyolbion*, 69; article on *Drayton's debt to Geoffrey of Monmouth*, 394
- Granville-Barker, Harley, review by, 229
- Grattan, J. H. G., reviews by, 118, 366, 368
- Gray, John, review by, 356
- Greg, W. W., and Cowley's dramas, 2, 5; article on Act-divisions in Shakespeare, 152; on Miss Albright's *Dramatic Publication*, 202; reviews by, 91, 449
- Guardian, The*, acted at Dublin, 17
- Gurrey, P., reviews by, 493, 494
- Hales, Stephen de, possible original of Chaucer's Franklin, 150
- Hamlet, More Etymologies for*, article by Kemp Malone, 257
- Hamlet*, III. i. 148 f., note by L. L. Schücking, 83
- Harold the Dauntless*, note on, 330
- Harper, Sir John, and John Marston, 86
- Harrison, G. B., review by, 447
- Harvard, J. P. Kemble's copies of Heywood's plays at, 139
- Hatton, Christopher, and *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, 35; and *A Treatise of Treasons*, 42; at Antwerp, 43; attempted assassination, 44
- Havens, Prof. R. D., note on an adaptation of Dryden, 88
- Hazlitt, W., *Hazlitt's Contributions to The Edinburgh Review*, article by P. L. Carver, 385
- Henry V, The Famous Victories of: see Famous Victories*
- Herford, Prof. C. H., his *Post-War Mind of Germany* reviewed, 489
- Heywood, Thomas, *Notes on his later Reputation*, article by L. B. Wright, 135, cf. p. 340; adaptations of his prose works and plays, 136-9; Restoration performances of his plays, 136; recent performances, 143; his hand in the *More MS.*, 238
- Hill, H. W., and the influence of the French Romances on Dryden, 57
- Historie of Cambria, The*, 70
- Histrionastix* as a travesty of *Mid. N. Dr.*, 78, 192
- Hodges, John C., article on *The Authorship of "Squire Trelooby"*, 404
- Hogg, James: see *Etrick Shepherd*
- Holland, P., his translation of Camden's *Britannia*, 395
- Hopkins, Charles, *Notes on [his] "Boadicea"*, by Baldwin Maxwell, 79
- Houghton, F. T. S., his *Place-Names of Worcester* reviewed, 366
- Hudibras*, circumstances of publication of, 161
- Hughes, Helen Sard, on a letter of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, 327
- "*Hundreth Sundrie Flowres, A*," *Further Research on*, article by B. M. Ward, 35
- Hunter, Sir Mark, and Act-divisions in Shakespeare, 152
- Husbands, H. Winifred, *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 122, 249, 375, 499
- Hutchinson, F. E., review by, 351
- Jenkinson, Hilary, his *Later Court Hands* reviewed, 227
- Jespersen, O., his *Notes on Relative Clauses* reviewed, 368
- Johnson, Charles, English version of *Nauffragium Jocularare*, 14
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, and Cowley's dramas, 7, 15, 21; his poem *On the Death of Dr. Robert Levet*, 88; *Papers by Dr. Johnson and Dr. Dodd* reviewed, 245

- Jones, C. E., his edition of *Peacock*, vol. vi, reviewed, 360
- Jones, Robert, his attempted assassination of George Turberville, 45
- Joyce, W., note on the mid back slack unrounded vowel [a], 337
- Keats, John, his *Endymion*, ed. Notcutt, reviewed, 485
- Kemble, J. P., his copies of Heywood's plays, 139
- King, R. W., article on Crabb Robinson and Shelley, 167; review by, 361
- Knyvet, Dorothy, 66
- Knyvet, Sir Philip, and Philip Massinger, 65
- Kosaul, Prof. A., article on Bishop Barlow and Friar Jerome Barlow, 25
- Kruisinga, E., his *English Grammar for Dutch Students*, vol. i, reviewed, 494
- Kyd, T., his hand in the *More MS.*, 238
- Laidler, Josephine, and Cowley's dramas, 8
- Lamb, Charles, and Cowley's dramas, 13, 21
- Later Court Hands in England from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century*, *The*, by Hilary Jenkinson, reviewed, 227
- Latham, Agnes M. C., article on Sir W. Raleigh's *Cynthia*, 129; see also 340
- Lawrence, W. J., on Act-intervals in Shakespeare, 78; and Act-divisions in *Mids. N. Dr.*, and *Histriomastix*, 191; note on turrets in Elizabethan theatres, 208; his *Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouses and Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* reviewed, 229
- Leopardi and Wordsworth*, by G. L. Bickersteth, noticed, 373
- "*Levet, Dr. Robert, On the Death of*," note by W. H. Gratian Flood, 88
- Llwyd, Humphrey, Welsh historian, 70
- Love's Riddle*, sources of, 3-6; Daniel Bellamy's adaptation, 6
- Lucas, F. L., his edition of the *Works of J. Webster* reviewed, 449
- Lupset, Thomas, his *Life and Works*, by J. A. Gee, reviewed, 441
- Lyly, J., proverbs in his *Euphues*, 354
- Macbeth and the "Short" Plays*, note by R. C. Bald, 429
- McIlwraith, A. K., article on *The Virgin's Character*, 64; note on "W. B." and Massinger, 326
- McKerrow, R. B., reviews by, 109, 224, 237, 352, 480, 482
- Malone, Prof. Kemp, article on *More Etymologies for Hamlet*, 257
- Manly, Prof. J. J., his *New Light on Chaucer* reviewed, 217; his identification of Chaucer's Franklin discussed, 145
- Marks, Jeannette, and Cowley's dramas, 5
- Marlowe, Christopher*, by U. M. Ellis-Fermor, reviewed, 447
- Marston, John, A letter*, note by W. H. Gratian Flood, 86; date of this letter, 212; Act-intervals in his *Histriomastix*, 78, 191
- Marstrander, C. J. S., and the etymology of *Hamlet*, 263
- Martin, L. C., his edition of the *Poems of R. Crashaw* reviewed, 349
- Massinger, Philip, and *The Virgin's Character*, 64; and "W. B.," 326
- Mawer, Prof. Allen, his *Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire* reviewed, 118; his *Place-Names of Worcester* reviewed, 366
- Maxwell, Baldwin, on Hopkins's *Boadicea*, 79
- Meads, Dorothy M., article on *Searching Local Records*, 173, 301
- Meissner, R., and the etymology of *Hamlet*, 259
- Merlin, Les Prophecies de*, ed. L. A. Paton, reviewed, 352
- Methodius, his *Bygymnyng of pe World*, ed. Perry, reviewed, 106
- Mid Back Slack Unrounded Vowel [a]*, note by W. Joyce, 337
- Milton, J., notes on text of his *Areopagitica*, by G. Bonnard, 434; variant issues of his verses before the Second Folio of Shakespeare, 497
- Miscellany of Tracts and Pamphlets, A, XVI-XX Centuries* (World's Classics) noticed, 498
- Molière, adaptations of his *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, 404

- Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley, an unpublished letter of, 327
- More, Sir T., his *Dialogue concerning Tyndale*, ed. Campbell, introduction by Reed, reviewed, 352; *The Saga and Myth of*, by R. W. Chambers, noticed, 373; see also *Booke of Sir Thomas More*.
- More Etymologies for Hamlet*, article by Kemp Malone, 257
- Morley, Prof. Edith J., her *Correspondence of Crabb Robinson* reviewed, 361
- Morte Arthure, The Dialect of*, article by S. O. Andrew, 418
- Much Adoe About Nothing*, IV. i. 145-160, note by J. le Gay Brereton, 84
- Naufragium Joculare*, sources of, 10, 136; English version by Charles Johnson, 14
- Nethercot, Prof. Arthur H., article on Cowley as a dramatist, 1
- New English Dictionary, A* (Wise-Wyzen), reviewed, 491
- New Methods for the Study of Literature*, by Edith Rickert, reviewed, 120
- Nicoll, Prof. Allardyce, and Cowley's dramas, 17, 22; and the Restoration heroic play, 49; his *History of Late Eighteenth Century Drama* reviewed, 355; second edition of his *History of Restoration Drama* noticed, 497
- Nidecker, H., and Coleridge marginalia, 432
- Nine Essays*, by Arthur Platt, reviewed, 488
- Nordfelt, A., and the etymology of *Hamlet*, 257
- Northanger Novels, The*, by M. Sadleir, noticed, 498
- Notcutt, H. Clement, his edition of Keats' *Endymion* reviewed, 485
- Nowell, Alexander, and *A Treatise of Treasons*, 39
- Ogilby, John, and Cowley's *Guardian*, 17
- Oliphant, E. H. C., his *Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* reviewed, 456
- Olivero, Prof. F., his translation of the *Andreas* noticed, 373
- Onions, C. T., on "Wite God," "Wite Crist," "God it Wite," 334
- Ordre of Chyualtry, The Book of the*, ed. Byles, reviewed, 440
- Origin and Development of 1 Henry VI in Relation to Shakespeare, Marlowe, Peele and Greene, The*, by Allison Gaw, reviewed, 100
- Oxford, Edward de Vere, Earl of, possible authorship of the *Famous Victories*, 287
- Oxford, Richard de Vere, Earl of, and the *Famous Victories*, 283
- Ozell, John, his authorship of *Squire Trelooby*, 408
- Pack of Autolycus, The*, ed. H. E. Rollins, reviewed, 482
- Palamon and Arcite*, R. Edwards' play, 204
- Papers written by Dr. Johnson and Dr. Dodd in 1777*, ed. R. W. Chapman, reviewed, 245
- Paradise of Dainty Devices, The*, ed. H. E. Rollins, reviewed, 480
- Parnassus Biceps*, ed. G. Thorn Drury, reviewed, 241
- Patient Grissell*, J. Phillip's, 424
- Paton, Lucy A., her edition of *Les Prophecies de Merlin* reviewed, 352
- Peacock, T. L. (The Halliford Edition, vol. vi), ed. Brett-Smith and Jones, reviewed, 360
- Pendlebury, B. J., and Dryden's conception of the heroic play, 51
- Penrith, A Grammar of the Dialect of*, by P. H. Reaney, reviewed, 369
- Perjur'd Devotee, The*, 15
- Perry, A. J., his edit. of Trevisa's *Dialogues* reviewed, 106
- Pettie, G., proverbs in his *Petite Pallace*, 354
- Phillip, John, A political reflection in his *Patient Grissell*, note by L. B. Wright, 424
- Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouses, The*, by W. J. Lawrence, reviewed, 229
- Pinto, Prof. V. de S., his *Sir Charles Sedley* reviewed, 474; reviews by, 241, 341, 468
- Place-Names: see *Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire*; *Essex*; *Worcestershire*

- Plague in Shakespeare's London, The*, by F. P. Wilson, reviewed, 109
- Plaine Mans Pathway to Heaven, The*, and *Hamlet*, 83
- Platt, Arthur, his *Nine Essays*, reviewed, 488
- Plays, 1591-1610, Act-divisions in, 153
- Plays and Masques at Court*, by Mary S. Steele, reviewed, 468
- Political Ideas of the English Romantics, The*, by Crane Brinton, reviewed, 113
- Pollard, A. W., and Chaucer's pensions, 83, 216; his *Early English Miracle Plays* noticed, 374; reviews by, 247, 488
- Pope, Miss E. F., and the Spenserian stanza, 207
- Post-War Mind of Germany, The*, by C. H. Herford, reviewed, 489
- Powel, David, Welsh historian, 70
- Powell, L. F., reviews by, 111, 484
- Powell, Martin, and an adaptation of Dryden, 88
- Pre-Restoration Stage Studies*, by W. J. Lawrence, reviewed, 229
- "Pyrenean," meaning of in *King John*, 209
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, article on his *Cynthia*, by Agnes M. C. Latham, 129; letter by J. P. Gilson, 340; his *Petition to Queen Anne*, 130
- Reaney, P. H., note on *Unfractured Forms in Thirteenth Century Place-Names*, 331; his *Dialect of Penrith* reviewed, 369
- Records, Local, article on searching, 173; Sessions records, 176; Borough Quarter Sessions records, 179; Municipal records, 184; Parish records, 305; Ecclesiastical records, 315
- Rede me and be not wroth*, 25
- Reed, Prof. A. W., his introduction to More's *Dialogue concerning Tyndale*, 353; reviews by, 217, 445, 479
- Relative Clauses, Notes on*, by O. Jespersen, reviewed, 368
- Restoration Drama, 1660-1700, A History of*, by Allardyce Nicoll, noticed, 497
- Restoration Heroic Play, The, The Sources of*, article by W. S. Clark, 49
- Restoration Tragedies, Five*, ed. Bonamy Dobrée (*World's Classics*), noticed, 497
- Rickert, Prof. Edith, her *New Methods for the Study of Literature* reviewed, 120
- Rinck, Hermann, and William Roy, 30
- Rival Nymphs, The*, 7
- Robbie, H. J. L., note on two undescribed MSS. of John Donne, 214
- Robinson, Henry Crabb, article on his *Opinion of Shelley*, by R. W. King, 167; *Correspondence of, with the Wordsworth Circle*, ed. E. J. Morley, reviewed, 361
- Rollins, Prof. Hyder E., note on Richard Edwards, 204; and George Turberville, 37, 46; his *Paradise of Dainty Devices* reviewed, 480; his *Pack of Autolycus* reviewed, 482; his edition of *Tottel's Miscellany*, vol. i, noticed, 374
- Romanticists, English, The Political Ideas of the*, reviewed, 113
- Rose, William, review by, 489
- Roy, William, and Jerome Barlow, 29
- Sadleir, M., his *Northanger Novels*, noticed, 498
- Sadler, Sir Ralph, and *A Treatise of Treasons*, 39
- Saint Edmund's Mirror*, 423
- Saint Erkenwald*, the Legend of Trajan and, 90
- Saurat, Denis, review by, 366
- Savage, Henry L., letter on *Saint Erkenwald*, 90
- Schelling, Prof. F. E., and Cowley's dramas, 8, 16; and the Restoration heroic play, 49
- Schücking, Prof. Levin L., note on *Hamlet*, 83
- Scott, F. N., his *American Slang* reviewed, 368
- Searching Local Records*, article by D. M. Meads, 173, 301
- Sedley, Sir Charles*, by V. de S. Pinto, reviewed, 474
- Sélincourt, Basil de, his introduction to Blake's *Selected Poems* noticed, 498

- Sells, A. L., and Goldsmith's sources for *The Citizen of the World*, 112
- Shadwell, T., his indebtedness to Heywood and Brome, 137; a song wrongly ascribed to him, 431
- Shakespeare, William, Act-intervals in early performances of his plays, 78, 191; Act-divisions in the plays, 152; his "short" plays, 429; relation of 1 and 2 *Henry IV* and *Henry V* to *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, 270; "Pyrenean" in *K. John* I. i. 203; note on *Much Ado*, IV. i. 145-160..84; note on *Hamlet*, III. i. 148 f., 83; the etymology of "Hamlet" 257; the heading *Actus Primus, Scena Prima*, in the First Folio, 323; Restoration versions of the plays, 472; Gaw's *Origin and Development* of "1 *Henry VI*" reviewed, 100; Wilson's *Plaque in Shakespeare's London* reviewed, 109; Thorndike's *Shakespeare in America* noticed, 373; *Specimens of Shakespeariana in the Bodleian Library* noticed, 373; Hazelton Spencer's *Shakespeare Improved* reviewed, 472; R. M. Smith's *Variant Issues of Shakespeare's Second Folio* noticed, 497; F. S. Boas's *Introduction to the Reading of Shakespeare* noticed, 498
- Shelley, P. B., Crabb Robinson's opinion of him, 167
- Sherburn, Prof. George, article on *Edward Young and Book Advertising*, 414
- Sheridan, R. B., his *Critic*, ed. Barnes, noticed, 374
- Sidney, Sir Henry, and *The Historie of Cambria*, 70
- Simpson, Evelyn M., article on *Donne's Punctuation*, 295
- Simpson, P., reviews by, 463, 468
- Smith, A. H., review by, 369
- Smith, G. C. Moore, review by, 441
- Smith, Hamilton Jewett, his *Oliver Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World* reviewed, 111
- Smith, Homer, and Cowley's dramas, 8
- Smith, Robert M., his *Variant Issues of Shakespeare's Second Folio* noticed, 497
- Smith, Sir Thomas, and attempted assassination of Christopher Hatton, 46
- Snyder, Alice D., notes on Coleridge's *Logic and Theory of Life*, 432, 433
- Some New Light on Chaucer*, by J. M. Manly, reviewed, 217
- Spenser, E., note on forerunners of the Spenserian stanza by Leicester Bradner, 207
- Spencer, Prof. Hazelton, his *Shakespeare Improved* reviewed, 472
- Spindler, R., his edit. of *The Court of Sapience* reviewed, 108
- Squire Trelooby*, article on the authorship of, 404
- Stage: see *Pre-Restoration* and *Theatres*
- Steele, Mary S., her *Plays and Masques at Court* reviewed, 468
- Stenton, F. M., his *Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire* reviewed, 118; his *Place-Names of Worcester* reviewed, 366
- Suffixvokal nach kurzer Tonsilbe vor r, n, m im Angelsächsischen*, von G. Weber, reviewed, 496
- Summary of Periodical Literature*, by H. Winifred Husbands, 122, 249, 375, 499
- Summers, M., and *Squire Trelooby*, 404
- Sykes, H. Dugdale, reviews by, 100, 456
- Syntax of Living English, A*, by A. C. E. Vechtman-Veth, reviewed, 493
- Tannenbaum, S. A., his *Books of Sir Thomas Moore* reviewed, 237
- Taylor, Prof. A. B., his edition of *Floris and Blancheflour* reviewed, 220
- Tempest, N. R., review by, 120
- Theatres, Elizabethan, Turrets in, 208: see *Physical Conditions*
- "They sleepe all the Act," note by J. D. Wilson, 191
- Thorndike, A., his *Shakespeare in America* noticed, 373
- Thornton, Robert, and *Morte Arthure*, 418
- Tilley, M. P., his *Elizabethan Proverb Lore* reviewed, 354
- Tottel's Miscellany*, anticipation of Spenserian stanza in, 207; ed. Rollins, vol. i, noticed, 374

- Treasons against Q. Elizabeth . . .*, A
Treatise of, 38; dedication, 40
- Trevisa, John, Perry's edit. of his
Dialogues reviewed, 106
- Turberville, George, and *A Hundreth
Sundrie Flowres*, 35; attempted
assassination, 45; Queen's Pardon,
45
- Turrets in Early Elizabethan Theatres,
note by W. J. Lawrence, 208
- Tyler, J. E., note on "Pyrenean" in
K. John, 209
- Tyndale, William, and Jerome Barlow,
29
- Tyndale, More's *Dialogue concerning*,
ed. Campbell, reviewed, 352
- Unfractured Forms in Thirteenth-Cen-
tury Essex Place-Names*, note by
P. H. Reaney, 331
- University Examination Results (1928),
506
- Vanbrugh, Sir J., and *Squire Trelooby*,
404
- Vechtman-Veth, A. C. E., his *Syntax
of Living English* reviewed, 493
- Villiers, George, his *Rehearsal*, ed.
Barnes, noticed, 374
- "*Virgins Character, The*," article by
A. K. McIlwraith, 64
- "*W. B.*" and Massinger, note by A. K.
McIlwraith, 326
- Waddell, Helen, her *Wandering Scholars*
reviewed, 224
- Waller A. R., and Glover, A., and the
canon of Hazlitt, 385
- Walmsley, D. M., note on a song
of T. D'Urfey, 431; review by,
472
- Walsh, W., and *Squire Trelooby*, 404
- Walton, Izaak, selected *Lives* by
(*World's Classics*), noticed, 497
- Wandering Scholars, The*, by Helen
Waddell, reviewed, 224
- Ward, B. M., article on *A Hundreth
Sundrie Flowres*, 35; article on *The
Famous Victories of Henry V*, 270
- Weber, G., his *Suffixvokal nach kurzer
Tonstille vor r, n, m im Angelsäch-
sischen* reviewed, 496
- Webster, John, *The Complete Works of*,
ed. Lucas, reviewed, 449
- Welsford, Enid, her *Court Masque*
reviewed, 463
- Welsh Element in the "Polyolbion," The*,
article by I. Gourvitch, 69
- Wendell, Barrett, *Essays in Memory of*,
reviewed, 479
- West, Friar John, and Jerome Barlow,
30
- Williams, Iolo A., his *Elements of Book
Collecting* reviewed, 247
- Willoughby, E. E., note on the heading
Actus Primus, Scena Prima, in the
First Folio of Shakespeare, 323
- Wilson, F. P., his *Plague in Shake-
speare's London* reviewed, 109
- Wilson, Prof. J. D., and Act-divisions
in Shakespeare, 152
- "Wite God," "Wite Crist," 334
- Wood, A. C., review by, 493
- Wood-Legh, K. L., article on Chaucer's
Franklin, 145; cf. 220
- Worcestershire, *The Place-Names of*, by
A. Mawer, F. M. Stenton, and
F. T. S. Houghton, reviewed, 366
- Wordsworth, Dorothy and William, by
C. M. Maclean, reviewed, 359
- Wordsworth, William. *His Doctrine
and Art in their Historical Relations*,
by A. Beatty, reviewed, 358; *The
Correspondence of Crabb Robinson
with the Wordsworth Circle*, ed.
Morley, reviewed, 361; see *Leo-
pardi*
- Wotton, Henry, and *A Hundreth Sun-
drie Flowres*, 35
- Wright, Abraham, his *Parnassus Biceps*,
241
- Wright, Louis B., article on T. Hey-
wood's later reputation, 135; cf.
p. 340; on Phillip's *Patient Grissell*,
424
- Wyatt, A. J., note on Chaucer's pen-
sions, 83; cf. also 216; on Chaucer's
"in termes," 439; review by, 496
- Young, Edward, and *Book Advertising*,
article by G. Sherburn, 414; attribu-
tion to Young of some verse of
Akenside's, 114; date of his *Night
Thoughts*, 330, 414